DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 221 086 HE 015 339

AUTHOR	Lightman, Marjorie, Ed.; Zeisel, William, Ed.
TITLE	Outside Academe: New Ways of Working in the Humanities. A Report on the Conference "Independent Research Institutions and Scholarly Life in the 1980s" (New York, New York, October 1979).
INSTITUTION	Institute for Research in History, New York, NY.
SPONS AGENCY	Ford Foundation, New York, N.Y.
REPORT NO	ISBN-0-86656-132-3
PUB DATE	81
NOTE	81p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Haworth Press, Inc., 149 Fifth Avenue, New York, NY 10010 ($12.00).
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Ethics; Financial Support; Higher Education; *Humanities; Institutional Characteristics; Institutional Cooperation; *Institutional Role; Organizations (Groups); *Private Agencies; *Research Projects; *Scholarship; *Standards

ABSTRACT

Proceedings of a conference on independent research institutions and scholarly life in the 1980s, which was sponsored by the Institute for Research in History, are presented. Summaries of workshops and the general session transcript are presented along with an introductory essay. A working papers essay is also included to delineate the major areas for discussion, including the following: relationship with academe, professionalism, standards and scholarly products, changes in the definition of professionalism, ethics, funding, and internal organization. It is suggested that currently no cohesive independent sector exists in the scholarly world of the humanities; instead, there are many groups with a variety of interests and problems. For the future, it is advocated that the independent sector establish its own identity and work out a relationship with the university that minimizes competition and encourages complementarity. Questions pertaining to professionalism that should be addressed include: the relationship between employment and research, the adoption of standards for scholarly products and services, and the need for new or more stringent ethics. Standards are needed for new scholarly products that are being produced, such as films, tapes, pictorial essays, and art exhibits. Ethical concerns include differences between research carried on in graduate schools or academic centers and "applied" research; how an institution or organization defines itself and its constituency shapes the projects for which funding will be sought. The introductory essay to the publication is "The Emergence of an Independent Scholarly Sector: History as a Case Study with a Select Bibliography" (Marjorie Lightman). (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

HE015339

ED221086

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Institute for Research in History

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

OUTSIDE ACADEME

NEW WAYS OF WORKING IN THE HUMANITIES

A Report on the Conference

"Independent Research Institutions and

Scholarly Life in the 1980s"

Edited by

Marjorie Lightman and William Zeisel

With an introductory essay by

Marjorie Lightman

HE 015 3.39

Co-published by

The Institute for Research in History

and

The Haworth Press

Copyright © 1981 by the Institute for Research in History. All rights reserved. No part of this work may be reproduced or utilized in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, microfilm and recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from the Institute for Research in History.

OUTSIDE ACADEME: New Ways of Working in the Humanities is co-published by the Institute for Research in History, and the Haworth Press, Inc., 149 Fifth Avenue, New York, New York 10010.

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data
Outside academe.

Proceedings of a conference organized by the Institute for Research in History held at Berkshire Place Hotel, New York, 18–19 October, 1979.
Bibliography: p.
1. Learning and scholarship—United States—Congresses. I. Lightman, Marjorie. II. Zeisel, William. III. Institute for Research in History (New York, N.Y.)
AS2.5.095 001.2 81-13463
ISBN 0-86656-132-3 (pbk.) A .CR2

Printed in the United States of America.

The Institute for Research in History is a non-profit organization of scholars in history and the humanities, founded in 1975 to provide a source of collegial contact and to generate research projects for scholars working outside the academic community. The Institute publishes two journals, *Trends in History,* and *Women & History,* and has a growing number of research, exhibition, and scholarly and publishing projects.

The Institute for Research in History
432 Park Avenue South
New York, N.Y. 10016
(212) 689-1931

CONTENTS

PREFACE v
by the Editors

INTRODUCTORY ESSAY: 1
The Emergence of an Independent Scholarly Sector:
History as a Case Study
with a Select Bibliography
by Marjorie Lightman

CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS
I Working Papers Essay 25
II Workshop Sessions:
1. Session chaired by Deborah Gardner 35
2. Session chaired by Dorothy Helly 43
3. Session chaired by Hilah Thomas 53
III General Session
Chair: Dorothy Helly 61

CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS 71

ORDER FORM 75

From the Conference Invitation:

The 1970s have posed a challenge to the university's dominance of American scholarly life. Faced with the constrictions growing out of complex social, economic, and demographic factors, the university has been unable to absorb its own production of graduate-trained people, especially in the humanities.

Institutions whose avowed purpose includes the support of scholarly life without the teaching component have long existed. Others have developed in response to this new situation. Regardless of their particular form of organization or the history of individual institutions, they face many similar problems.

This conference will provide the occasion for a discussion of these problems and for a consideration of the future role of these independent research institutions in American scholarly life.

PREFACE

"Independent Research Institutions and Scholarly Life in the 1980s," a conference organized by The Institute for Research in History and funded by the Ford Foundation, met at the Berkshire Place Hotel, New York City, on the 18th and 19th of October, 1979. It brought together fifty people from five constituencies of American scholarly life: independent scholars, established organizations outside the university, new organizations, semi-autonomous institutes within universities, and foundations.

Designed as a two-day meeting, the conference included papers, workshops, and general discussion. The first day opened with two papers. "Before the University," by Thomas Bender of the New York Institute for the Humanities (New York University), discussed American scholarship and its networks before the university's rise to dominance in scholarly life during the late 19th century. "Professionalization and the University," by Burton Bledstein (University of Illinois, Chicago Circle), examined the impact of professionalization on American scholars and the language used to designate scholars, scholarship, and scholarly associations. Reflections on the intellectual and economic conditions of the 1970s were presented by speakers representing five organizations: Mariam Chamberlain of the Ford Foundation; Richard Brown of the Newberry Library; Lydia Bronte of the Rockefeller Foundation; Ronald Gross of Future Directions for a Learning Society; and Deborah Gardner of The Institute for Research in History.

On the morning of the second day, the participants

divided into three workshops, each exploring the range of problems facing non-academic scholars and organizations. In the afternoon the conference participants convened in a general session where they shared and discussed the workshop deliberations and pondered future directions.

In presenting the results of the conference, the editors faced a difficult question. The typed transcript of the workshops and general session came to over two hundred pages. To present these remarks verbatim, along with other conference materials and the papers delivered on the first day, would produce a large and expensive volume and would not necessarily communicate the pith of the conference. The editors decided instead to produce a short, relatively concise report that would convey the intellectual and institutional problems over which the conference ranged. For this purpose they have used only the transcripts of the workshops and the general session of the second day. These transcripts have been summarized and, where appropriate, remarks have been paraphrased or given verbatim. In order to produce a roughly parallel discussion of points in each workshop, some re-arrangement of material has been done. The transcript of the general session, shorn of its opening remarks, where representatives of each workshop summarized the morning's discussion, is given verbatim with some deletions.

As an aid for the reader in following the development of the main themes discussed at the conference, the summaries of workshops and the general session transcript have been preceded with a short essay, "Working Papers," written by the coordinators of the conference, Marjorie Lightman and Howard Negrin, which presents a series of questions considered to be useful points of departure for discussion.

An introductory essay, by Marjorie Lightman, Executive Director of The Institute for Research in History, traces the rise of the university and the effects on scholarship of shifting patterns of government funding. The volume begins with this historical essay, proceeds to the conference workshops, and concludes with the general session and the participants' discussion of the future of the independent scholarly sector in the United States.

We would like to thank the Ford Foundation for having made possible the conference and the publication of this report. We would also like to express our special appreciation to Dr. Mariam Chamberlain, whose steadfast support for the Institute has extended far beyond this project.

INTRODUCTORY ESSAY

The Emergence of an Independent Scholarly Sector: History as a Case Study

with a Select Bibliography

by Marjorie Lightman

Many scholars in search of tenure-track university appointments lead marginal lives as poorly-paid, peripatetic academics. Others have found niches in government, industry, and cultural institutions where scholarly training and its pursuit are valued, at least with lip service. A few have founded new associations to provide useful services to the public and private sectors where such scholarship is considered functional and is valued. From an historical perspective the scholars of the third group are special. Never since the late 19th century have humanities scholars outside the academy sought to share with peers inside the academy the rights and prerogatives of scholarly leadership. When the academy was unable to absorb the many graduate-trained students in the humanities who sought university appointments during the 1950s, for example,

these scholars simply left academic life for careers in government and industry. Most of them also left the scholarly professions; they organized no new constituencies of scholars, no new institutions, and no new groups who demanded professional recognition of their scholarly pursuits as peers with their colleagues in the academy.

The 1960s and 1970s were different from earlier periods in important ways. Political and social activism on campus placed universities and scholars in a position of national prominence. New functions and new constituencies became a part of the university as new sources of funds, especially from the federal government, enlarged facilities, faculties, and student populations. The humanities' professions expanded in number and opportunities, while research questions changed and new methodologies, as well as new fields of inquiry, came to the fore.

As the 1960s gave way to the 1970s, and issues of civil rights merged with the anti-war movement, questions arose about the responsibilities of scholars and the role of the university. The conflicts of these years set the tone for a generation of students, whose classroom learning was accompanied by participation in national debates often led by student peers. In a rapid turn of events, when retrenchment overshadowed issues of war and peace, the same students, now newly-minted PhDs, responded to suddenly altered circumstances with ideas molded a decade earlier. Ideas about the role of the university and the collective responsibility of the scholarly professions, articulated in the 1960s and early 1970s, became the immediate historical antecedents for a sector of humanities' scholarship which, in contrast with other times, has sought new settings, new audiences, and new ways of communicating scholarly ideas and research.

The changes of the past twenty years came upon the university and the scholarly professions in the humanities after eighty years of evolving a uniquely American university style and professional *cursus honorum*. Beginning in the late 19th century, colleges adopted an organizational form of departments, schools, deanships and vice-presidents with a single administrative head responsible to a board of trustees. As a mode of organization borrowed from successful business corporations of the day, it needed little

justification. This organizational mode, however, also eroded an older, holistic relationship between the professor and the school, in favor of the specialized teacher/scholar who was categorized by discipline.

An allegiance to peers in a given discipline, at the expense of the university as a whole, was further encouraged by the development of national groups that cut across institutional lines. National scholarly organizations and learned societies proliferated; the American Historical Association (AHA), for example, was founded in 1888. At the same time, the identity of faculty as a distinct group within the larger university, sharply distinguished from administrators, led to the growth of faculty associations, often tied to national associations. In 1915, after several critical court cases involving tenure, the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) was founded. Although teaching remained the common denominator among faculty members nationwide, professional status within a discipline came to rest on an assessment by peers, most of whom were outside the scholar's own institution, for whom the scholar's teaching was less easy to evaluate than published work. Research presented to peers at meetings, in journals, and in monographs became the basis for status in the wider profession and an essential means for advancement within one's own institution.

Prestige and status, not tied to any single university affiliation, assumed a new importance after 1965 when Congress created the National Foundation for the Endowment of the Arts and the Humanities, under whose jurisdiction fell the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA), the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) and, as a part of NEH, the state commities for the humanities.

The budget of NEH grew from $2.5 million in 1965 to $150 million in 1980. This government support was a wholly new infusion of money which, despite a one-third growth in private humanities support between 1965 and 1979, made the government into a patron of humanities scholarship unthought of twenty years before. The increase in funds also encouraged the growth of skilled grant-getters, people undaunted by forms who could write lawyer-like briefs and who had a talent or inclination for administration and organization as well as for research.

Many scholars developed multi-year institutional projects, often moving from teaching to administration by way of project directorships, for what amounted to mini-companies within the university, with the independent authority to hire and fire, dispense patronage, and publish. Grant-getting skills also became part of graduate education. As student aid, fellowships, and assistantships proliferated, expanding from $933 million in 1970 to $2.961 billion in 1980, each academic year included a regular round of filling out forms, writing essays, and selling ideas on paper for the next year's support (*Statistical Abstracts*, 1979, p. 165). Far more carefully than they trained for teaching, graduate students learned the rules and techniques of grants and fellowships. Although not everyone pursued grant money, grants became a new aspect of professional scholarly life and possessed status and remuneration at least equal to the older scholarly pursuits.

One cannot speak of the humanities by 1980 as a single category of professional endeavor, however. The disciplines which compose the humanities have maintained separate identities, as reflected in the departments on campus and in the world of publishing. Over the years, the proliferation of specializations within any single discipline has eroded even the unity of those disciplines. Nonetheless, within this fragmented world of professional humanities scholarship, tradition still accords a special place to university-affiliated scholars united in national scholarly associations that are defined by discipline.

By virtue of their inclusive character in an otherwise diverse world, the scholarly associations are one arena where the cross-currents of change in scholarly and academic life during the past twenty years can be viewed with a national perspective. The associations, which were traditionally open to all interested in the pursuit of specialized knowledge, gradually came to reflect the attitudes of those who were part of higher education: "academic" became synonymous with "scholar." Since mid-century, organizations such as the American Philological Association, the Modern Language Association, and the American Historical Association have been dominated by their academic constituents.

The associations provide similar services. Each

publishes a journal and a newsletter, awards prizes to noteworthy works in the field, and acts as a clearinghouse for bibliographical and general information about the state of the discipline, primarily as it is practiced on university campuses. Each sponsors a regular national meeting where scholarly papers are presented and where, in addition, there is a market place for publishers and jobs. Perhaps most importantly, meetings reinforce professional and social bonds among a large number of geographically dispersed scholars, emphasizing their shared identity as constituents of a particular field of scholarly inquiry.

Among established associations, the American Historical Association (AHA) is reasonably representative. This derives largely from the nature of history as a subject of study and from the evolution of history as a professional endeavor. Historical research has adopted techniques from the social sciences, such as quantitative analysis and model building, in addition to traditional literary analysis and textual criticism. The range of approaches has given the discipline an inclusivity which has earned the historian the sobriquet of generalist. At the same time, the discipline of history has been fragmented by the proliferation of specialties. This process reflects the increasing specialization characteristic of the society at large and the professionalization of scholarship itself. In addition, the new-found wealth of the humanities in the years since 1965 has been of special benefit to historians. The October 1963 *Newsletter* of the AHA reported that in the preceeding year, out of a Congressional appropriation of $9 million to the National Science Foundation, historians had received only 29 grant awards totalling $451,000. In the years after the creation of NEH, grant awards to historians and history-related projects have often been the major area of funding by the Endowment.

In a review article on history doctorates from 1961–1970, in the AHA *Newsletter* of September 1972, Warren Kuehl traced the new degree of specialization which eroded the generalist approach of the 19th century, and also what he considered a new degree of imagination in research topics. He observed that traditional fields, such as ancient history, the American frontier, and American agricultural history, were declining in popularity, and that

black, Indian, and urban history topics had gained at the expense of political history and traditional foreign policy studies. Although religion remained a popular field of inquiry, new interest was evident in such topics as pacifism, periods of social upheaval, and the American Progressive era.

The changes in doctoral dissertation topics observed by Kuehl were also noted in *Newsletter* articles between 1965 and 1972. The October 1968 *Newsletter,* for example, contained the report of a survey of 124 graduate programs in history, concerning their attitudes toward interdisciplinary research and programs of an interdisciplinary character. Not surprisingly, the article concluded that the greatest receptivity to an interdisciplinary approach was among younger faculty, whose interests included urban studies, ethnic studies, women's history and the other topics which fit Kuehl's definition of a new imagination in defining research areas. A second article in the June 1968 *Newsletter* summarized a questionnaire about the application of quantitative data to historical research. According to the survey, the greatest use of quantitative techniques was in political history, followed by social history and cultural history. These results mark the movement of quantitative techniques from specialized application useful for a few historians to a more general acceptance of such techniques in a variety of research areas. They further substantiate the shift of research patterns suggested by Kuehl in his review of doctoral dissertations, a bringing to the fore of cultural and social history, in a field traditionally dominated by political history. Kuehl attributed the new importance of social history to a concern, especially among young historians, with events and issues of paramount importance to the country during the 1960s. The university was then in the unaccustomed position of being not only home for a large segment of the population most active in the civil rights and anti-war movements, but also a focus for the implementation of goals sought by movement participants. Alterations in university admission policies and degree requirements were a consequence of pressure for change experienced on the campus. Programs to encourage minority admissions, a wider choice of courses to satisfy undergraduate degree requirements, and changes in graduate language examinations and doctoral examinations were a part of these years.

These changes accompanied a dramatic increase in graduate school enrollment. Kuehl noted that a total of 13,579 degrees had been awarded through history departments: 7,695 between 1872 and 1960 and 5,884 between 1960 and 1972. In addition, thirty-two schools had introduced PhD programs whose successful candidates did not yet appear in the 1970–72 statistics. Yet this startling rate of increase in new programs represented only six percent of the total number of schools in the PhD business. Equally startling was a rapid growth in the size of older departments. The University of Georgia, for example, had awarded two degrees until 1960 and eighty-five between 1960 and 1970.

The increase in enrollment and degrees awarded cannot be separated from the Selective Service laws which exempted graduate students from the draft. As distaste for the Vietnam war grew, graduate school became an increasingly attractive alternative to military service. In addition, the university's humanistic tradition and professional *cursus honorum,* and its service to a humanistic heritage, allowed those who sought social equality and those who opposed the war to collect in the single institution likely to support their ideals. This sympathy and support, reflected in ambiguous official reactions to many student-led disruptions, could polarize campus life. Polarization tended to forestall repressive action against dissident groups, creating a *stasis* that prevented any resolution among the conflicting parties and viewpoints.

Often the conflict was as much an education as anything happening in classrooms, libraries, and seminars. Subtly, but effectively, a change occurred in the socialization of students, especially graduate students. Central to professional scholarship had always been respect for authority and tradition. Authority and tradition, however, were exactly what were being challenged; not only the social traditions of the university as they had evolved since World War II but views of the fundamental relationship between the university and the larger society.

Conflicts in individual history departments carried over into the AHA. In the *Newsletter* during 1969–70 many of the issues came to a head over a series of proposed constitutional revisions for the Association. Writing in November 1970, Carl Landaver reviewed the growth of the AHA

membership over the previous 15 years, from 4,000 to 17,000. Constitutional revisions were needed, he argued, to alleviate strains produced by the "broader conditions of national life that [were] simultaneously affecting all professional groups" and by the fact that the "AHA had proven less amenable to respond to these conditions than it might otherwise have been, because it had never adequately adjusted its internal governance to meet the needs of vastly enlarged membership."

More than a year earlier, the Association had begun to address the issue of internal governance for a vastly expanded membership. The *Newsletter* published the minutes of a meeting of the Association's governing council, held on April 12, 1969, in which a proposed set of constitutional revisions was readied for presentation at the December 1969 annual business meeting. The council supported a one—rather than three—year presidency, since the office brought administrative responsibilities which left little time for an historian's scholarly pursuits. The council also left the choice of president open to the membership, rejecting automatic promotion of the vice-president, and decided that two candidates for the presidency would be offered the membership by the nominating committee. The use of a nominating committee was itself viewed as a procedure which protected the interests of those in numerically small fields and insured that leadership would rotate among a geographically diverse membership. Finally, the council tried to insure a sufficiently representative assembly at the annual business meeting. Although the December conventions were held around the country, regular participation was uncertain because members bore the cost of attendance. They proposed, therefore, to use a mail ballot on issues where the business meeting and the council disagreed, to guarantee a decision representative of the membership at large.

In the fall, the editors opened the *Newsletter* to a discussion of the proposed constitutional revisions. The ensuing debate rested on fundamental differences in viewpoint about the nature and purpose of a scholarly association. In a letter in the December *Newsletter,* Ann Gordon argued that the use of mail ballots as proposed by the council was a technique to reduce "public debate and

group action." This desire to curb public discussion, Gordon continued, raised questions about the purpose of the organization. Although all could agree that the Association should promote historical study, this "benign" goal failed to examine "the forms and results of its promotion." Therefore, failure to address the "forms and results" of historical study also failed to address the responsibilities of the Association to its members and to the society at large.

As pointed as Gordon's was a second commentary on the proposed changes written by Staughton Lynd and Arthur I. Waskow, in the same *Newsletter*. They proposed a five-point statement of principles which would move the Association "toward meeting the needs and desires of historians in the midst of the sweeping social changes America [is] now undertaking." The purpose of the organization, they stated, was to promote historical study pursued in such a manner as to "broaden historical abilities and knowledge among the general public" in order to "demystify the holders of power and serve democracy." They also sought an "ethical code that would forbid historians to discriminate against women, Blacks, radicals, etc." and would place historians in the service of a humane society. They emphasized the need to share power within the Association with graduate students and the "historically concerned public," and for Association funds to be invested in firms and institutions which were non-racist, non-militaristic, and non-exploitative. Finally, to encourage interested members of the public to become historians, they proposed a Special Fund for the Liberation of Historians, which would be free of sexism, racism, and political biases.

After the December meeting, in February 1970, a new section was inaugurated in the *Newsletter*. The editors' introductory remarks noted that "events which marked the Association Business Meeting reflected very real and deep divisions among members of the Association as to the nature and responsibilities of the profession. The differences went far beyond the practical questions on which votes were taken and touched fundamental issues as to the nature of history and society."

The first essay of this new section, entitled "Radicals, Conservatives and History: 1969," by Arthur I. Waskow,

appeared in the same issue. Waskow concurred with the editors' assessment of events at the December meeting. Rhetorically, Waskow asked, "What is a Profession? Does it have a politics and should it?" He reviewed the radical proposals as alternatives to the council reforms: an expanded council of fifty members, consisting of ten each of students, elementary and secondary school teachers, non-professionals interested in history, and eminent scholars; the organization of a special fund to support those unable to attend the annual convention and business meetings; the democratization of meetings so that proposals from the floor, carried by vote of those present, would be binding on the council; and a more open procedure on agenda changes. The radical proposal for expanding the council offered legitimacy to members of the profession other than scholars in universities. In addition, Association members were asked to make a financial commitment to alter the demography of the profession and to allocate funds to those who traditionally had little or no voice in the profession. Finally, instead of a mail ballot, to insure representation funds would be available to promote attendance, in the belief that if the widest attendance was achieved, the association would be open to freer discussion, alterations in agenda, and a binding vote on the council.

Waskow argued that the radical program was in harmony with changes in the larger society—a move to a more open democracy, to the inclusion of new groups, and to greater discussion and public debate. It was a political program in both the broad and narrow sense of the politics of the Association and, Waskow argued, the conservative position of the council was itself no less political. Pointing to the response to resolutions condemning American intervention in Vietnam, also introduced at the 1969 meeting, he noted little opposition to the substance of the resolution. Disagreement concerned the propriety of a scholarly and professional association taking a position on a contemporary and overtly political issue. Those who supported the conservative position argued that the resolution drew the profession into conflicts outside its scholarly purpose. Waskow characterized this position as a separation of "citizen and scholar," which defined and circumscribed the pursuit of scholarship without regard for its uses in the

society of which it was a part. This, Waskow concluded, carried an implicit political position disguised by tradition, whereby the scholar was conceived as a craftsman free from any responsibility for the use of his products.

The business meeting, Waskow continued, was a contest of power, with radicals and conservatives organized to secure the adoption of motions in the interest of their respective positions. Critical to the radical vision of a union between scholars and citizens was an open and meaningful debate, a situation precluded by a contest in which individual differences were tantamount to group disloyalty. In the name of the radical platform, Waskow concluded, there emerged an "oligarachy of the left" to confront the oligarachy of the right; open and free discussion was the victim. Thus, although the council proposals were carried by vote at the business meeting, Waskow claimed it was a hollow victory for the council. The experience, he observed, taught the younger generation of historians unintended lessons about the futility of seeking effective change within the Association, and convinced them that any new vision would of necessity grow outside the structure of the AHA. At the end of the essay Waskow announced the creation of such a new structure: the Radical History Caucus.

Disillusionment with the Association was far from universal in 1969. The same convention saw the creation of the Coordinating Committee on Women in the Historical Profession. The CCWHP was an informal caucus whose goals were "the encouragment and recruitment of women into the profession, the monitoring of discrimination against women and the development of Women's History as a branch of historical study" (AHA *Newletter*, February 1973). The emergence of the caucus reflected a growing feminist self-consciousness and the increased awareness of discriminatory practices against women within academe. In its organization the caucus also reflected a vision shared with the radicals: it was conceived as a network of regional groups which sought to be inclusive rather than exclusive. Graduate students, historians on faculties, and women historians, regardless of their place of employment or lack of employment, joined together as equals to share ideas and to create the new history of women.

The women's demands were recognized at the 1969

meeting by the creation of an ad hoc committee on the status of women, whose charge was to assess the position of women in the profession and to bring a report to the 1970 meeting. According to the report excerpted in the September 1972 *Newsletter*, the number of women receiving doctorates, never high, had decreased from 1950. In history, women doctorates for 1969–70 were about thirteen percent of the total, and women receiving master's degrees about twenty-seven percent. The percentage of women on faculties was far lower. Between ninety-eight and ninety-nine percent of faculty were men, with women holding lower rank when they were represented at all. Equally important was a progressive deterioration in the status of women in co-educational institutions. In 1959–60 sixteen percent of full professors were women, whereas in 1968–69 only one woman full professor remained in the ten co-educational institutions surveyed. The report proposed that a major factor militating against the advancement of women was the "widely-held assumption that women prefer to marry and devote themselves to domestic life." The report noted that this assumption had already been challenged by the statistics in Helen S. Astin's *The Woman Doctorate in America* (1968) as well as in later studies. At the 1970 business meeting the Ad Hoc Committee, under the direction of Willie Lee Rose, successfully fought for the adoption of a number of resolutions aimed at the "policies and practices in the training, recruitment and academic promotion of qualified women and the establishment of a standing Committee on Women historians." This new standing committee was charged with exercising "sustained attention and pressure indispensable to an advance on the status of women" and was assigned a special assistant in the executive offices of the association.

The women's success in securing passage of the resolutions rested partly on the nature of the proposals and partly on the fact that their demands followed the radical/conservative fight of 1969. Since the mid-60s there had been increased anti-war sentiment and rising pressure on behalf of groups traditionally discriminated against. Originally separate, the two movements increasingly mingled and gained a broader base of support. This broadened support included scholars who lacked the ideological commitment

of the radical core. In other words, at the 1969 business meeting radicals found sympathetic support from the more conservative historical community for proposals opposing the Vietnam War, redressing discrimination, and expanding the leadership of the profession.

Although no one has done a prosopography of the leadership of the CCWHP and the radical and peace caucuses, there certainly was a significant overlap of membership. Women such a Berenice Carroll, Blanche Cooke, and Sandi Cooper, to name only a few, owed a dual allegiance. The effect of the overlap was evident in the caucus structure of the CCWHP and in the consciousness that the history of women was a part of the history of groups oppressed and hidden from traditional historical investigation. In contrast with both the peace and radical caucuses, however, the CCWHP held to no rigid ideology and could include historians on the periphery or outside of the radical and peace groups, historians whose feminism was limited to the pursuit of professional equality, and those whose feminism saw historical study as a path to gender analysis and fundamental rearrangement of social relationships.

The broadened base of support upon which the radicals drew in 1969 was partly the result of a general demographic change in the profession. The statistics on new PhDs, in Kuehl's review article in the September 1972, *Newsletter*, demonstrated that the profession had become weighted toward its newer members. At the same time, authority within the Association remained with the established generation. The radical/conservative floor fight of the 1969 business meeting, therefore, had characteristics of a generational split as well as of a fundamental difference in intellectual perception. The CCWHP reflected the same demographic shift. In addition to women historians who had found a niche in the profession before the new feminist self-consciousness of the 1960s, there was also a new group of women who were part of the expanded graduate programs of the late 1960s and early 1970s. Both groups contained women committed to a radical ideology. The younger group, however, held a generalized self-consciousness, not necessarily radical, which meshed with that of the established radical women around women's issues.

In contrast with the radical platform presented in 1969, the demands of the CCWHP were clearly focused on the redress of discrimination against women within the profession. The demand was for equality rather than a radical restructuring of the Association and the profession at large. The emphasis on equality of opportunity drew support from the more general community, which lacked any commitment to radicalism but was sympathetic to erasing discrimination. Thus the leadership of the CCWHP, overlapping that of the radical and peace caucuses, formed a coalition with women outside the radical core, especially younger women, to demand of the Association changes in policy supported by a broad spectrum of the members.

The political activities of the CCWHP in the early 1970s were strengthened by the growth of women's history. From the founding of CCWHP, one of its goals had been to have women's history recognized as a legitimate discipline. The 1970 panel on women's history drew an audience as large and as excited as the 1969 panel on radical history. The discovery of women's history, part of the larger movement in social history begun in the late 1950s, owed much to radical historians like Jessie Lemish who argued for history "from the ground up." In the political relationship of CCWHP and the Association, however, women's history was the intellectual glue bonding women across the traditional divisions of the subdisciplines and differing modes of historical analysis. Women's history could be studied in ancient Rome or in 19th century America, and women were interested in research about women irrespective of the specialty in which they were trained. This interest was manifest throughout the early 1970s at both the regional and national meetings and in the CCWHP newsletter. In New York, for example, monthly CCWHP meetings routinely included both political activities directed at the AHA, in support of women in the profession, and the presentation of research in progress in women's history. The national newsletter had the first widely disseminated bibliographies in women's history, information on course outlines, encouragement for creating women's history courses, and exchanges among women whose focus of research was shaped by a new self-consciousness and who, in turn, were aware they were creating a new field.

By 1973 women had secured a far more visible place in the association. There was a permanent Committee on Women Historians (CWH), greater participation by women on panels, sessions devoted to women's history, child care at the conventions, a register of women historians (to counter the claim that it was impossible for universities and colleges to find enough qualified women to fill faculty positions), and a special assistant for women at the AHA national headquarters (AHA *Newsletter,* February 1973). At the very time these successes seemed to be producing important change, however, a new concern surfaced that was to dominate the profession for the rest of the decade and make many demands for redress of employment discrimination of secondary importance.

In 1969, appeared the first mention that some new PhDs were having trouble finding academic appointments. During the 1970s the job market tightened further. At its simplest, there was an increase in the number of PhD holders, exceeding the demand for new faculty despite a growth in overall student enrollment. There was also a reduction in the number of history courses that students were required to take. An economic recession in the mid-1970s aggravated all other conditions.

The relationship, between the increase of graduate students and graduate programs in the 1960s and the constricted market of the 70s, became the most often discussed issue in the *Newsletter's* correspondence. The proposal most frequently mentioned was to restrict programs to bring supply and demand into balance. Throughout 1970–72 many such proposals were put forth, of which one, by Justin Paul from Wisconsin State University, in the May 1971 issue, was typical. Spurred to write by a barrage of unsolicited job applications from individuals and departments seeking appointments for their own graduate students, Paul proposed that no new PhD programs be initiated until further notice, that programs initiated since 1965 be phased out, that those started between 1960 and 1965 be closely examined with an eye toward elimination, that an upper limit be stipulated on the number of candidates at any school in a single year, and finally, that PhD programs might be lengthened but certainly not shortened in duration.

In the same newsletter, James Young wrote that beyond the assertion of a "job crunch" in the historical profession as part of a "larger crisis in higher education," there had been little discussion in the *Newsletter* about the nature of the historian's role in the university or society. Continuing his commentary, Young noted that professionalism in scholarship, as it was commonly used in *Newsletter* correspondence, was more properly called "craftsmanship." The pursuit of a craft, he went on, was an attribute of the skilled worker who received wages in exchange for work. Historians in particular and faculty in general had identified with the self-supporting "professional bourgeoisie" and management rather than with skilled workers. In contrast to secondary and primary school teachers they had avoided trade unionism. Young recognized the strong objections to trade unionism in higher education, but noted that "high standards of craftsmanship . . . a demand for higher productivity . . . [and] worsening conditions, with neither relief nor greater remuneration in the offing" provided "tacit support . . . that a Ph.D. glut exists" despite classrooms of hundreds in survey courses.

Generalized to the profession as a whole, the analyses of Paul and Young carried political echoes of the conservative/radical split at the 1969 business meeting. The inclusivity characteristic of the radical platform in 1969 stressed the need for services to be performed by PhD historians in the education of the next generation, regardless of the market forces defining the size of the university and its faculty. The suggestion to limit the numbers of PhD programs and historians was, in effect, a retreat on the part of the higher education establishment from a commitment to reach beyond its traditional constituency and to provide for minorities, women, and non-traditional student populations. On the other hand, Paul's arguments recognized the *realpolitik:* graduate education in the humanities was a highly specialized pursuit with only a limited constituency, and in the face of constricted applications within the university it had to accept a more limited cadre of professionals.

The analyses by both Paul and Young assumed that the primary vocational application of professional history was university teaching; both also assumed that the established generation of professional teacher/historians was respon-

sible for the future of their students and the profession. As it evolved by mid-century, the PhD in the humanities was inseparable from the concept of tutelage under an established teacher/scholar whose responsibilities extended beyond the supervision of the dissertation. Ideally, the established scholar was the student's patron, using his *auctoritas* to secure opportunities for publishing, reading papers at conferences, attaining university appointments, fellowships, and research money. This was done formally by the writing of recommendations, informally by the network of personal relationships that moved each cohort of graduate students into the professional ranks (Smelser and Content, *Academic Market*).

The rapid expansion of graduate education in history during the 1960s and early 1970s often diminished the personal quality of the traditional patron/client relationship between student and mentor. In his review article in the 1972 *Newsletter*, for example, Kuehl noted that despite the development of new PhD programs, more than fifty percent of the increased numbers of PhDs awarded came from the twenty-one major research universities. However, the expansion in the number of institutions offering PhDs affected the traditional relationship by placing graduate students in the hands of mentors who were themselves not far removed from their students days. This was especially true in universities where graduate programs had grown rapidly and new faculty were being recruited in a sellers' market.

Within departments across the country there also occurred a routinization of procedures concerning fellowships, research money, and the search procedure for faculty appointments, in response to pressure from federal and state agencies. This routinization opened access to research support and teaching appointments, somewhat lessening the club-like atmosphere characteristic of the discipline at the beginning of the 1960s. When the AHA *Newsletter* began publication in 1962, for example, it prominently recorded news of individual appointments, promotions, publications and research awards. As the 1960s progressed, personal information became secondary to professional issues, such as teaching, the finances of the Association, academic pay scales, and new research interests. By the late 1960s the *Newsletter*, although grown

significantly in size, no longer routinely recorded personal professional notes.

As the job market tightened the *Newsletter* reflected the expectations of young historians, who were rooted in the traditional mentor relationship. The graduate student unable to secure an appointment which five years earlier had been there for the asking once again turned to the generation of established scholars to secure his passage into the ranks of the profession. The AHA, responding to this problem, formed a National Coordinating Committee (NCC) which sought to create new opportunities for historians outside the university by working with corporations to encourage the hiring of historians. In addition, at its business meetings during the middle and late 1970s, the Association passed recommendations which encouraged history departments to offer summer work to unemployed historians, to give them library privileges after graduation, and to provide them working space as a professional courtesy. There was also discussion of ways in which universities could create unpaid honorific positions, such as that of research associate, in order to extend an affiliation to its unemployed.

From the perspective of those caught in the constriction of the job market, however, the response by the profession was a failure of leadership. This failure led to increasing disillusionment and frustration. Writing in the September 1975 *Newsletter,* Robert Elsasser commented: "As an unemployed Ph.D. I think I express the general sentiment of others in my position when I say that the collection of tenured middle-aged and post-middle-aged individuals who control the AHA and the history departments of American colleges have done little except impotently wring their hands and shed crocodile tears over the plight of younger members of the profession who are totally unable to find work." He noted quite accurately that the recommendations made by the AHA for work sharing within departments were largely ignored. The NCC was underfunded and understaffed from its initiation, and more importantly, it failed to involve any significant number of senior people in the pursuit of new forms of employment for historians.

All during the 1970s the AHA *Newsletter* portrayed a new division within the profession between the unemployed, underemployed, and precariously employed on the

one hand and those with secure appointments on the other. The division by university appointment cut across the radical/conservative split of the preceding decade. Gordon Wright, president of the Association, summarized the position of the employed in the 1977 *Newsletter* when he noted that the Association would continue to pursue means for employment outside the university. Nevertheless, this generation of historians could not all expect to obtain employment in line with their training within or outside the university. In more subtle ways, the leadership of the profession continually revealed its frustration over those caught in the academic market constriction. The November 1974 *Newsletter,* for example, noted that employment interviews at the annual meeting had been moved away from other activities, a move justified by the need for expanded space to alleviate the disorder of earlier meetings.

The acceptance of a market reality brought little solace to historians looking for work. Yet, for the most part, they had no proposals significantly different from those adopted at the Association business meetings or proposed in letters like those of Paul and Young.

The taboo against moving outside the university or, phrased otherwise, the power of university affiliation as the definition of a professional historian, remained evident in the constant theme for affiliation, even without remuneration, that ran through the demands of the unemployed. Elsasser himself suggested that a "vigorous" program of redress on the part of the Association toward the underemployed would include a freeze on PhDs for the subsequent five years, an extension of Paul's proposal that was certainly not an original solution. Whether from lack of imagination, inclination, or political clout, there was to be no WPA of historians or increased federal aid to schools to hire the unemployed.

Nevertheless, the need for work increasingly made community colleges, libraries, museums, historical societies, foundations, and even publishing and government into the ancillary fields most easily entered for professional historians. These fields held some of the same assumptions, derived from their non-profit or low-profit-margin psychology, that characterized the four year college and university environment. The shift to other employment, even into these fields, however, also meant a realignment of

expectations, the disappointment of not attaining the coveted goal, and a sense of personal failure. In addition, and often as important, there was a loss of faith in a leadership, toward whom graduate school had inculcated respect and dependence.

Within this group of unemployed, underemployed, or precariously employed, was a significant percentage of women. By virtue of a reawakened self-consciousness among women, and expanded opportunities in higher education, women were entering graduate training in increasing numbers, just when the constriction in academic jobs had begun. When the CCWHP was formed in 1969 it brought many of these women together and strengthened bonds among them. The CCWHP newsletter for these years conveyed a sense of high excitement as women discovered and exchanged information about women's history and news about each other within the profession. It is notable that until 1976 there was no particular focus on a constriction in the job market or on the inability of women to find work.

The lack of focus on the job situation did not derive from ignorance or apathy. Information about opportunities for work was one of the important exchanges among the group. In 1974, there appeared a moving piece in the CCWHP newsletter detailing the experience of a young woman historian in the "slave market" of the 1973 AHA convention. The lack of focus on jobs was a corollary of women's marginal situation in the profession, even in good times. The AHA Ad Hoc Committee (Rose) Report, presented in 1970–71, elucidated the professional discrimination against women. Less clear were the effects of discrimination on the expectations of women who pursued professional history scholarship. The small percentage of women on faculties at major graduate schools meant that most women worked with male colleagues, among male students, in a world dominated by male values which included the assumption of women's lesser value as scholars and as professional colleagues. Whether or not women internalized their inferior position, and no doubt many did, their continued existence within a professional setting depended on the ability to work within the male environment. In contrast, the CCWHP was a female professional world that never excluded any male colleagues who sought

to participate. For many women in the early 1970s—those who had begun graduate school in the late 1960s and those who had received their training earlier—this was a unique experience.

Within the CCWHP women found colleagues from across the country interested in issues and ideas unshared with their mentors or viewed with skepticism by their male colleagues. The degree of alienation or marginality experienced by women historians in the male-dominated professional world was as important to female bonding as the clarification of professional expectations. An already established generation of women scholars—Gerda Lerner, Joan Kelly, Louise Tilly, Willie Lee Rose, Natalie Zemon Davis—became role models who bridged individual departments, schools, or institutional affiliations. They became intellectual and political mentors who taught new modes of professional relationships grounded in a feminist professional psychology. The dual leadership role was strengthened in 1972 when funding for women's studies became available. Alice Rossi, Gerda Lerner, and Florence Howe, for example, were among those scholars funded by the Ford Foundation. At the same time, the Ford Foundation began a program of doctoral fellowships in women's studies which gave the field a legitimacy in the face of male skepticism. When the middle 70s brought a more general change in funding policies with regard to the humanities, women's studies and women scholars were sufficiently well placed to benefit from it (Kanter, *et al.*, "Review of Grant Making," pp. 89–90, 100, 108–110).

After 1975, public and private foundations altered their funding policies. They became increasingly interested in projects which addressed issues of public policy and projects which had some component of social action. Women's studies, and projects which brought academic research to the public, received proportionately more money than research in subjects with less immediate general application. In other words, studies of Byzantine land tenure were more difficult to fund than studies of land tenure among rural blacks in the American south, and both lost ground to programs to bring rural blacks into the university. The application of funds reflected the effects of the 1974–75 recession and the larger society's concern for a functional return on investments in the humanities. The political real-

ity of limited public money was especially evident in the development of support for the state humanities councils. Before the 1976 Congressional reauthorization of NEH, state councils, empowered to support public issue programs for the adult out-of-school population, existed at the option of the Endowment. Since 1976, the state-based programs have been assured funding by Congressional mandate. Their continued existence has given humanities programming a new dimension at the state and local levels. Films, art exhibits, lecture series, radio programs, and conferences which join scholars and the general public have sought to develop whole new constituencies for the humanities outside the university.

By the second half of the 1970s, when the constriction in the job market reached crisis proportions, an alternative professional path had been constructed by the confluence of the marginal character of women within the profession, the maturing of a feminist caucus that supplied an alternative professional reference group, role models and leadership, and access to support for humanities projects in women's studies and community settings. Women, whose enrollment in graduate programs had proportionately increased during the preceding decade, formed themselves into such groups as Women Historians of the Midwest (WHOM) and The Institute for Research in History in New York City. Research and professional activities, in the form of papers read at conferences, articles in scholarly journals, and monographs, were extended to include projects designed for the non-university audience, especially in the field of women's studies. In 1976 the IRH, for example, became a corporation independent of any university and organized around research groups, small groups of members interested in similar problems of historical research. Its origin in the New York Metropolitan chapter of the CCWHP was evident in its "special commitment to the study of women's history and the promotion of women in the historical profession" (IRH *Constitution*). The first project the IRH undertook with support from a humanities agency was a pictorial exhibition, "Women at Work," funded by the then very young New York Council for the Humanities.

By the late 1970s, private foundation support for the humanities had recovered from the 1974–75 recession to increase by nearly one-third over the early years of the

decade. The political atmosphere of the decade, which emphasized programs with some component of social action over programs of research into a more distant past, continued to shape humanities research both within the university and within the newer coalitions of scholars who were focused by circumstances to careers outside traditional academic history departments. Centers for women's studies developed at the City University of New York, University of Arizona at Tucson, and Stanford in California, to name only a few. Funded primarily by grants from private foundations and public humanities agencies, especially the Ford Foundation and the NEH, the centers had a dual commitment to traditional research and to programming that joined the community and the university.

Although the growth of women's studies as a scholarly field is a most dramatic instance of public and private foundation support which realized the social consciousness of the decade, it is only one example: labor studies, ethnic studies, and urban studies are others. As with women's studies, labor studies, for example, flourished within and outside the university. Labor unions, along with history departments, sponsored major projects with the same dual focus of research and public education. The similarity of growth in these fields and their general focus of research and education, often outside the traditional classroom, was not accidental. Their roots lay in the new social history of the late 1950s and in the radical tradition of the scholarly professions enunciated in the late 1960s. Intellectually they derived from the tradition which argued for the union of citizen and scholar in forms reaching beyond the narrow professionalism of the academy and the research university. They were part of the radical attempt to redesign the methodology and subject matter of scholarly research in order to include people, ideas, and problems different from the questions which dominated scholarship from the late 19th century through World War II.

In sum, there is an historical development from the passions loosened by the civil rights movement and the Vietnam War which led to a debate over the role and responsibilities of scholars and scholarship in the society; through the sequence of events which brought an end to the expansion of the university at the same time that enlarged cohorts of graduate students began to seek work; to a

growth in scholarship in fields such as women's studies pursued in the university and in settings outside the university. The re-orientation of public and private support for humanities research in 1974–75 reflected the debate five years earlier in the AHA *Newsletter* when feminist caucuses such as the CCWHP nurtured a new generation of women scholars for whom the radical viewpoint of the 1960s was the basis for a professional definition.

The reorientation of financial support in line with needs for research and programming not only addressed new questions, new groups, and new settings, but also reflected the larger society's efforts to realize changes inaugurated in the 1960s, of which support for women's studies was only a small part. The emergence of scholars organized to pursue research and programming under the aegis of newly-formed institutes or in non-university settings as varied as labor-union-supported centers, libraries and museums, was consonant with the decade's larger social movements, developments within the university, and the character of scholarship demanded by a society in pursuit of ends radically altered over a period of twenty years.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

AHA *Newsletter* (Washington, D.C.: AHA, 1962–1979)

Bernard, Jessie. "My Four Revolutions: An Autobiographical History of the ASA," in *Changing Women in A Changing Society*, ed. Joan Huber (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1973)

Breneman, David W. "Efficiency in Graduate Education: An Attempted Reform" (issued by the Ford Foundation, 1977)

Jencks, Christopher, and Riesman, David. *The Academic Revolution* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1977)

Kanter, Rosabeth Moss, *et al.* "Review of Grant-Making for Women's Issues in the 1970's: Past Patterns and Future Priorities" (report to the Coordinating Committee on Women's Programs of The Ford Foundation, April 1977)

Letters and reports from the CCWHP Archives (Schlesinger Library, Radcliffe College)

Scholarly Communication, The Report of the National Equiry (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1979)

Smelser, Neil and Content, Robin (*The Academic Market*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1980)

Statistical Abstracts of the United States (United States Department of Commerce, 1979)

"Toward the Restoration of the Liberal Arts Curriculum" (Working papers of The Rockefeller Foundation conference of September 28, 1978)

I

WORKING PAPERS ESSAY

The independent sector is extremely varied, including research libraries, museums, independent institutes, centers, consortia, professional organizations, unaffiliated scholars, and semi-autonomous institutes in universities. Many of these are hybrids, incorporating the ideals of the university, the *modus operandi* of profit-making businesses, American entrepreneurial traditions, and awareness of political possibilities. What universities and businesses do is fairly clear: they provide formal education or products and services. What independent groups connected with particular professions do is also clear. Who the independent sector serves and what it produces are still to be defined, however. The continued existence of the independent sector depends on its ability to define its role in the world of scholarship and in society as a whole. What follows, therefore, are delineations of the major areas for discussion among members of the independent sector, in the hope that they will lead to a clearer self-definition.

Relationship with Academe

Like the university, independent scholarly groups are primarily concerned with the pursuit of knowledge. It is more essential for them than for

the university that society be willing to support research and that they be able to demonstrate why such research is important. The independent sector and the universities often share the same sources of support and the same audiences for their research, however. Independent scholarship is therefore part of a competitive nonprofit sector which, in the humanities, has limited capital and a limited constituency. It would be unfortunate if success for the independent sector came at the expense of the university. The independent sector must not only establish its own identity in the next decade but must also work out a relationship with the university that minimizes competition and encourages complementarity.

Professionalism

Many new independent groups have developed in the last decade, often in response to the needs of people caught by changing social conditions. Other groups have a long history and an established position in the scholarly world. Changing times have not benefited the established groups, however. The same forces that have bred new groups have reduced membership in professional organizations. Furthermore, the pressure on established groups from those who find traditional careers closed to them has led to a sense of loss of purpose and confusion over their responsibility. The independent sector has to deal with such questions now, especially questions about professionalism: the relationship between employment and research, the adoption of standards for scholarly products and services, and the need for new or more stringent ethics.

Standards and Scholarly Products

Traditionally, the scholar's product has been the article or monograph, especially in the humanities. In the past few decades more varied scholarly products have apepared, such as films, tapes, pictorial

essays, and art exhibits. Technological change in the next decades will probably provide other forms. Scholars today, both in and out of the university, are concerned about how to evaluate the quality of the scholarship in these products. It is especially important for the independent sector to develop criteria of evaluation, since these new forms will help define its special character and the nature of its contribution to society. This is not to suggest that traditional written forms are not important in the independent sector. Rather it recognizes that the conditions of independent groups differ from the formal education function that underlies the university, and that in this case the differences may be more important than the many similarities.

Changes in the Definition of Professionalism

Scholars in the independent sector are already redefining professionalism and dealing with questions of standards. The philosophical and practical commitments of a variety of independent groups are marked by their participation in programs designed for the out-of-school population, contract research, and research presented both in forms easily accessible to the general public and in traditional scholarly articles and monographs. What remains is to articulate changes, many of which have already occurred.

A professional is usually defined as someone who has specialized training and earns money from activities associated with that training, whether as historian, philosopher, doctor, lawyer, or anthropologist. In the past, the university offered scholars employment as teachers, giving them financial security and the time and facilities for research. University teaching and scholarship became a single profession. The independent sector severs this union. Still to be detailed, however, are the ways and means of according status and recognition by peers to scholars, some of whom pursue scholarship part-time, some of whom are gainfully and satisfactorily employed in the profit-making world, and some of whom pursue the vocation of university teaching.

Ethics

The redefinition of professionalism challenges the status quo. Discussions of the new field of public history suggest ethical problems that apply to all the humanities. They arise from the differences between research carried on in graduate schools or academic centers and "applied" research. Scholars employed by government agencies and private industry may find themselves asked to express opinions about problems they feel have not been sufficiently investigated. They may have to depend on notes taken by other researchers or acquiesce with positions determined by others. They may have to work under the sort of time constraints that are necessary in industry or government but are not necessarily conducive to sound scholarship; some also have to learn teamwork after being trained in graduate schools that emphasize individual effort.

There are also ethical problems faced by institutions. What is an institution's responsibility for a completed product? What control should an institution have over the subject of a research product? What happens if a project is not completed according to the terms of the contract? In general, how can the collegial traditions and individualism characteristic of university research in the humanities be adapted to conditions outside the university?

Funding

All the above questions affect how independent institutions acquire funds. How an institution or organization defines itself, what stance it seeks to adopt within the scholarly community and the general society, and who it decides is its constituency shape the projects for which funding will be sought. To some degree, however, the projects developed within the independent sector are a direct response to the guidelines set out by the agencies, regardless of the group's unique needs. The current state of flux, which has led to the

growth of new institutions and has altered older ones, suggests now is the time for discussion between the major funding sources in the humanities and members of the independent sector.

There are three main questions. 1) What are the differences between independent groups and universities? How are the financial needs of independent groups different, and how should this affect the kinds of projects they propose? It might be useful, for example, to discuss the funding of projects that could result in products able to generate some residual income and thus aid new institutions to become financially stable. 2) What responsibility should funding agencies have for the growth of an independent sector? How would such support affect the future funding of universities and university projects? 3) Should the independent sector seek funding outside traditional sources? Is there a moral obligation to fund the independent sector from limited humanities resources, or should the independent sector assume a marketplace attitude and offer products and services in exchange for income?

There should also be discussion of such matters as part-time scholarship, funding cycles that are not tied to the academic year, joint projects by several institutions, and networks for the dissemination of information other than the usual scholarly networks.

Internal Organization

The form of an organization usually derives from its purpose, history, and constituency. In all cases, however, there is the problem of how to relate organizational structure to long-term goals. Critical to a successful group or institution, moreover, is a sense of community among members and a public identity within both the scholarly world and the larger society.

New groups have a special concern. They must articulate and communicate a vision that excites a potential constituency. At the same time, they must give concrete expression to their vision. Established groups can draw upon tradition, but for continued vitality regeneration is

essential. How to carry on a constant examination of institutional purpose and of projects in the light of that purpose is the most difficult and elusive problem of internal organization.

Related to this problem are questions such as these: How can a close relationship be established between leadership and membership? How can authority be exercised in the name of the group and in accordance with collegial traditions inherited from the university? How can confidence and trust in the institution be developed? How can the membership have a sense of joint endeavor and joint success?

National groups have additional problems. How, for example, can a national membership be maintained without diminishing the importance of the individual and discouraging individual participation? How much does a central administration have to do in order for widely dispersed members to feel an identity and a loyalty? How can national groups use regional sub-groups to involve more members directly? Finally, is it even possible to have a high degree of membership loyalty, identity, and participation beyond the regional level?

Multidisciplinary groups have another set of concerns. Communication is more difficult across disciplinary lines. When members have needs derived from different disciplines, limited resources are strained and stresses within a group are intensified. To adapt the model of the broad, multi-disciplinary university to the independent sector is clearly a more difficult challenge than that faced by one-discipline centers, institutes, and consortia. With these additional difficulties, are there any advantages to multidisciplinary groups in the independent sector and in society at large? What procedures might independent groups use if they chose to seek multidisciplinary membership?

Conclusion

There is currently no cohesive independent sector in the scholarly world of the humanities; instead, there are many groups

with a variety of interests and problems. Are there advantages to greater self-consciousness about their common interests? What can be gained if their activities are coordinated and they speak with a single voice as a recognized bloc within the humanities? Last, but by no means least, how can greater self-consciousness be achieved?

II

WORKSHOP SESSIONS

1. Session Chaired by Deborah Gardner

1. Relationship with Academe

Referring to page 2 of the worksheets, Gardner posed the question: "What is the position of the independent sector in the scholarly community . . . what would we like to see in the future?" Holtzman asked if the independent-sector groups are going to be partial to the kind of research that is done in universities, or are going to undertake research that is not being done in the university. If the latter, it will be necessary to develop new research tools and find a new constituency.

Quandt agreed with this statement of the situation: "We have to do something other than compete with the universities." It is necessary to go in new directions, to reach out to the adult community, for example, or become technologically innovative. And doing new things doesn't rule out doing more traditional activities.

Varady asked why the new groups of the independent sector had come into being in the first place. One reason, he thought, was that so many highly trained PhDs have no employment prospects in the traditional sectors and have therefore joined together in interest groups in order to use

their talent and training. Gardner added that in the New York area in the 1970s there were also some cultural reasons for the efflorescence of independent-sector groups. Discussion groups, including advanced graduate students and faculty and academic administrators, met frequently and regularly to discuss common research interests. This made it easier for the process of institutionalization to occur. Varady offered similar examples from his own area, Tucson, Arizona, and noted how these groups began to lose their "coffee club atmosphere" and became increasingly concerned with real problems and issues.

Kirkendall questioned how the new groups could "do what the universities do not do, because universities do all the things that have been mentioned," including outreach and research. He tended to agree more with the argument that independent-sector groups reflect the economic reality of too few traditional jobs for talented recent PhDs. In addition, he thought, there is simply too little research being done in the universities and elsewhere: "A very small percentage of the historical profession actually engages in research, and we're discovering new dimensions all the time that need to be explored. There just isn't enough research and talent employed in the universities, and we cannot let talent go to waste."

According to Rubenstein, independent-sector groups have a greater intellectual freedom than universities because "there is no higher structure, because there is an intermingling of perspectives." Kaplan offered the example of her own research group in the Institute for Research in History, as being a place where "you're allowed to make mistakes," which one cannot afford to do in one's university department. The importance of independent-sector groups for the sense of community they provide, especially for women, who have often been restricted in their intellectual opportunities, was stressed by O'Driscoll. Independent-sector groups, she emphasized, constitute a sector that exists on the "margin" of learned and intellectual life and plays an important role in providing a basis of communication between the established institutions and the rest of society.

Varady thought that by institutionalizing the independent sector does things that the university does not do or

does not do exhaustively, or well enough. This was seconded by Quandt who thought the universities, in their outreach attempts, are trying to "bring the scholarship of the humanities to the public" by means of the classroom, "which is certainly a valid approach, but there may be other approaches." Stellhorn thought the institutionalization simply reflects the needs of individuals for a firmer base. These individuals, trained to work in the traditional sector, would fit well in that world if they were offered a position in it. The independent sector, it seemed to him, does not represent something unique or new, and its members do not "have that much to show us as far as articulating a purpose. I think they're floundering around quite a bit."

To this Holtzman replied by noting that changes in patterns of education are producing a new public, and this is having a significant impact on certain organizations, such as museums and libraries. The role of these institutions has changed markedly over the years; more people go to them and public demands on them have increased. All kinds of activities take place in libraries now, not just reading books. The greater level of education and the desire for life-long education have contributed to this, and the trend will continue. Here is a phenomenon that will provide opportunities for the independent sector.

Bernstein, speaking of her experience with The Institute for Research in History, said that it provides a professional structure in which to think about history: "I wouldn't be doing it on my own; I wouldn't have support."

2. Professionalism

Kirkendall raised the question of standards. He called for a code of ethics, "so we can distinguish the good and the bad and guarantee those people who are likely to employ us that the person to be employed is actually capable of doing good work . . . " It was his understanding that in historical preservation, a rapidly growing field, the bad are driving out the good because "the shoddy operator who cuts corners gets the

contracts, and the employer has no way of knowing whether he's capable of doing good work or not."

In fact, Gardner replied, the historical preservationists have begun to professionalize and are setting standards according to "the traditional way of handling these problems, which is to establish themselves as arbitrators of quality." Holtzman asked if "the current crop of historians didn't have a professional code of ethics?"

The importance of credibility was stressed by O'Driscoll. The Institute for Research in History, for example, requires its members to participate in research groups, and this has made it "believable" as a serious research organization, "and fundable." Gardner added that membership requirements include the PhD or some equivalent evidence of skill in historical research. She then touched on a question discussed earlier, whether historians should operate solely in the academy. The independent sector, and especially the Institute for Research in History, she noted, have been trying to convince the academy that the PhD should not automatically lead to a teaching job.

Although Kirkendall agreed that "there aren't just two goals out there but there are various goals out there," he was not sure about the changes that should take place in content of programs. Perhaps graduate training must become even more complex than it is now, including not only basic historical skills but other skills "necessary to use history outside of the academy. . . " Although enthusiastic about a conference on public history recently held in Santa Barbara, he worried that soon there will be too many public history programs, some of which may be of low quality. He was concerned that historians might move into the field before being really qualified.

The large number of PhDs in government was raised by Stellhorn, who cited New Jersey, where at least one department has more historians than lawyers.

Kaplan said that historians are already learning about alternatives to the academy, but the outside world was only just learning: "I'm not sure it's even necessary at this point to tell this generation that they can do things outside; I think its important to tell the outside that this generation can do things outside their field of study."

O'Driscoll wondered about the apparent "mania for institutionalizing. We have enough trouble getting these things going and administering their organizations, so that they never have time to do research; and then to put another layer on top of that . . ."

Gardner raised the question of how to define professionalism. Does employment in a particular field constitute professionalism, or some sort of lifetime involvement, whether or not it is paid employment? The conventional definition of historian is one who works in a university as a scholar and teacher. Holtzman noted that in the U.S. it is difficult to do intellectual and scholarly work without an affiliation, although it is frequently done in Europe. Hurwitz asked "why the PhD has to be the standard thing?"

Kirkendall said that probably the PhD was too narrow "because I recognize all kinds of professional historians who are working outside the academy." He mentioned Barbara Tuchman as an example, but excluded most people associated with local historical societies:" [they] are involved because history is a way of glorifying the community . . . or their ancestors. I can't regard that as a professional attitude."

That was a narrow point of view, replied Stellhorn, who wondered if he would ever want to use the term professional. "You make your money, your income," he continued, "from practicing that craft. These [historical society] people, I don't think they're out to glorify their ancestors or their towns." Kirkendall asked which people Stellhorn was talking about, those employed by the society or the "bankers and newspaper men and others who come to the annual meeting?" "Unfortunately," replied Stellhorn, "there are no bankers."

A broader definition was offered by Kaplan. "It's not where you make your money," she said, "but your temperament and interest." She related a recent experience that had set her thinking about the whole question of professionalism. Asked by a friend if her name could be used as a reference, she had described herself on the reference form as a historian. The friend asked if instead Kaplan would describe herself as the director of the organization she headed, "because they won't know what it means to be a

historian." When Stellhorn inquired why non-academic historians couldn't simply be called scholars, Kaplan responded that scholars "implies interest and training." "What about self-training?" asked Stellhorn. If they are self-trained, thought Kaplan, she wouldn't consider them scholars. She offered the recent surge of interest in genealogy as an example she was familiar with. A cousin of hers compiled "a small social history that went back to the 17th century . . . while doing it, for whatever reason, he was able to do a good job. I would call that historical, I wouldn't call that scholarly."

Scully agreed with the general sentiment, that researchers and scholars need a structure within which to work, a structure that must take account of economic and vocational factors. His real question, he declared, was whether or not the independent sector is a "one-time phenomenon." Graduate schools have pared back admissions, so that the excess of PhDs over academic jobs is beginning to diminish and may eventually disappear.

Bernstein said that if it was up to her, she would want to have more PhDs in history produced "because I think there are some really valid disciplinary skills there." She offered the "cycling in and out" process as one way to avoid a sharp dichotomy between academic and non-academic historians. Before World War II, she explained, there was greater movement of PhDs from academy to business and government, and back again.

Kaplan, expressing complete agreement, referred to letters in recent issues of the AHA *Newsletter* discussing the question of what constituted a historian. She thought that the declining membership in the AHA is partly a result of the organization's failure to reach out to historians who are employed in government and the private sector.

Gardner noted that despite all the letters to the *Newsletter*, the AHA still uses the traditional, academic definition of historian: "We have to recognize that there are very strong forces in the traditional sector which are going to argue the maintenance of the status quo." Quandt registered her strong agreement with this statement. Even people in the independent sector, she said, want to go on doing all kinds of traditional scholarship that they were trained to do; it gives them a sense of professional identity and security. It

is not easy to have so many highly trained people suddenly turn around and say "we're going to redefine our role and produce these different kinds of products."

Kirkendall said he did not know what direction his organization, the Organization of American Historians, would take on that matter. He hoped it would become a much broader organization, both in the size of its membership and in the degree to which members participate in making decisions and in the variety of interests represented. In fact, the OAH had just completed a poll of its members about what kinds of research and professional activities American historians should engage in.

It was not easy, O'Driscoll thought, for organizations to enlarge their scope of operation, as the OAH was attempting, and one reason for the rise of the independent sector has been "because organizations get entrenched in a certain pattern, as we know from the women historians trying to change the AHA." Kirkendall said the women historians were having an impact. The real issue, O'Driscoll replied, is whether large organizations, like the AHA and OAH, can provide the face-to-face atmosphere of the smaller institutions. They cannot, Kirkendall agreed, and in fact the OAH will become less face-to-face as it expands along the lines he envisioned: "We need to become much larger in order to have the resources to do these various other things." The OAH will not obviate the need for smaller groups such as The Institute for Research in History but rather will play a service role and help coordinate activities of the smaller groups. "Well," observed Hurwitz, "here is a good point for our conference . . . we have a distinction between the role of a professional society and the role of an institute filling a certain need that the larger organizations never could fill and apparently never will."

II

WORKSHOP SESSIONS

2. Workshop Chaired by Dorothy Helly

1. Relationship with Academe

Helly opened the session with a brief description of the scope and nature of the conference. An independent sector for scholarly life already exists, she observed, and the questions to be addressed are "who are we, what is our future;" and the "notion of the conference, that our future is indeed in our hands: it will be what we want it to be." It is therefore "our pleasure and our responsibility," she continued, "to look very carefully, at this early stage, at the definition of who we are and what we want to be for the purposes that have already brought us into existence, and for purposes which might arise as we grow more mature over the next decade."

Early in the workshop the issue was raised of what kinds of groups and organizations should be included under the independent sector rubric. Gross suggested that in addition to the groups listed in the worksheets, one ought also include networks, which he defined as "associations that are not in a specific place, that are in no sense centers, but which are the medium for a tremendous amount of intellectual discourse."

Banner noted that there is a wide variety of organizations capable of advancing and promoting scholarly research, and then asked whether "independent sector" was an appropriate term, given its current use to describe certain public interest groups such as John Gardner's Common Cause. A third word, he suggested, should be put in the phrase, perhaps "independent research center, independent learning center, something of that sort." Wortman offered "intellectual sector." Banner resumed, noting that in the humanities, historians seem to have played a role out of proportion to their numbers and to have gone "a step faster and farther in this regard."

The question of the kinds of groups that might be included in the independent sector was taken up by Shatan, who described the innumerable organizations and networks that have populated medicine and psychiatry, especially during the past 20 years. In his own field of psychoanalysis, for example, "nearly all the training and research is in either completely autonomous or semi-autonomous institutes. Most faculty members are adjunct and receive little or no remuneration, and most research goes on with little or no support from the university. These groups are often extremely flexible and offer unique opportunities for research." For example, Shatan noted, the historian Frank Manuel had for several years audited seminars on psychodynamics and psychoanalytic interview, to prepare for his work on Isaac Newton. Thus "the cutting edge of new thinking . . . is taking place out of the established organizations and outside the university; whereas the established organizations are mainly concerned with maintaining . . . their own existence and with monopolizing certification, licensing and things of that nature." Shatan's comments set the independent sector in a broader context and also raised the question of its relation to the university.

This was addressed by Cantelon, who began by alluding to the earlier comment about how historians seem to have played a disproportionate role in the humanities. He noted that the people in question had all been academics, and that this is "the root of the problem for the independent sector." The question, he noted, is "the decision of how closely identified do you want to remain with the academic

world?" Most members of the independent sector, he observed, have only tenuous links with the academy; this was evident at a recent conference in Santa Barbara on public history. But public historians are no longer "satisfied with being the step-children" of the academic world. "As they more clearly define—I think the issue of definition is important—their role in terms of the academy, in terms of the rest of the world . . . they will organize differently." This is happening, he said, but slowly, "because that apron string with the academic world is terribly strong."

The task is not to compete with the academy, Banner responded, but to cooperate with it in order to nurture learning in all fields. The universities still have great vitality: "The will has not been marshalled, but to think that there are not great reservoirs of intellect, of brilliant scholarship, or learning . . . is simply dead wrong." Wortman, agreeing with this sentiment, noted that the issue "keeps obtruding in a way which is unhealthy to both the independent institutions and the university."

Banner then expressed the hope that the independent sector would represent not only the scholarly community but "the larger world of learning," by which he meant to include "teaching, the transmission of knowledge . . . the organization of people who are not teachers or on faculties, to expose them to the knowledge that is offered by the humanities." It would be regrettable, he thought, if an independent sector developed only within the world of scholarship, "although that certainly is the reference point of the Institute for Research in History and a lot of us here at this meeting." This related to the question of what the independent sector might contribute that the universities cannot: "One of the things it has got to be able to contribute . . . is something in addition to teaching and research."

The discussion then turned to the question of precisely how the independent sector is to differentiate itself from the university. Granted that the two sectors must cooperate, what unique contributions could the independent sector make? This was the question put by Woods, who observed that he did not sense, from the discussion of the past two days, "that we have been suggesting a role that is unique

from that which is carried out by the university." It remains an open question, he noted, "whether there will be any real substantive or interpretive contributions . . . to the overall body of knowledge that informs society that cannot be made or will not be made within the . . . university."

In reply, Stanwick offered one way in which the groups of the independent sector differ from the academy: "their lack of givens, lack of hierarchy [and their use of] the mind in ways that may be more freely expressed, experimented with, be failures, and allow us to go on to the next thing in a way which is harder to do in many ways within the university . . ."

2. Professionalism

The discussion began with Stanwick's comment that in sociology one's professional identity is almost impossible to preserve outside the academy. Those who do "the kind of research that is acceptable within the traditions of sociology," work in universities, whereas people who work in government, industry, independent research firms, and consulting firms lose contact with the professional organizations and associations. Political science is in a similar situation, she noted; in this respect historians "are rather unique."

Within the independent sector, it was agreed by those present, a major problem is evaluating projects that do not fit traditional molds. This was expressed by Groneman, who observed that when scholars give lectures, they can be evaluated on generally accepted terms, but they are much more difficult to evaluate when they are the authors of a film proposal, for example, or part of a film team. The same difficulty relates to exhibits and radio programs.

The role of intellectuals who are outside the academy was raised by Cobb, who cited the case of public history. Here, she observed, there are historians working in the community who have no status or recognition within the academy, and at the same time there are historians teaching public history in the universities "who have had no experience doing public history; it's rather silly." The way to help

these two groups cooperate is "through standards or methods or evaluations that are not only accepted in the independent sector but also by the university as well, so that there isn't that gap."

Woods said that standards outside academe are going to be determined "to a large extent by the marketplace, which may not be something that we like to think of." The nature of the research "will be governed to an extent by what proposals are accepted by the funding party, according to their lights." Cantelon demurred, arguing that the marketplace will govern standards only if the independent groups "let it happen." The clients who constitute the marketplace, he argued, have no standards pertaining to the humanities, and so the issue is really up to the researchers: "They want a product and we have to set it up for them, to guarantee them an acceptable product." It is the task of the independent researchers to "develop" their profession in such a way "that they can sell it to other sectors, other groups."

He cited the example of several government historical offices which established advisory groups to set standards. The groups, consisting mainly of academics, had mixed results. It is therefore important for the independent groups to establish their own committees on standards, "because if we are not there first I am troubled that somebody else will try to plug them in for us." Researchers in independent groups, he noted, are better able to understand the problems and concerns of that sector than are academics.

This view was supported by Wortman, who reiterated the point that researchers cannot let clients set standards, since this only leads to the transformation of information to fit the client's views, when the real purpose of the researcher should be to "lead and enlighten" the clients. She then returned to the point of credentials and asked how these were to be developed. One must continue to use certain academic criteria—number of publications, degrees held—but it may be possible to combine some of these with work experience in the field, for example, to produce a kind of apprenticeship status that might work as a credentialing acceptable within and without the academy, even if the researcher has not published, or has published but does not hold a PhD.

There was no agreement on the extent to which the independent sector should certify its people, whether it should merely check to see that they meet minimum criteria, should actually test them in some way, and whether it should evaluate their research. Cantelon expressed concern over "linking credentials to standards or ethics." Credentials look back to the academic world, where most humanists receive their training, and "I would hate to see the group get involved with the whole issue of are you properly licensed."

Cimino referred to the question of maintaining standards and suggested that independent-sector groups should more closely interact with government agencies when the agencies write the specifications for work to be contracted out. Often the agencies "have no idea of the kind of expertise they need . . . often they write very minimal scopes of work to satisfy environmental agencies, and in fact don't get the work done." Not much has been done, for example, to address the issues that non-academic anthropologists face: "If you are doing research for a client who owns the research material, who decides what can be made public?" A corporation, he hypothesized, is considering several sites for a new plant in a Third-World country, and anthropologists are consulting on the project. The sites are confidential, and can't be disclosed until a final decision has been made, "and that puts anthropologists in a quandary as to where their responsibilities lie. We face all sorts of problems there."

Shatan observed that there seem to be two conflicting viewpoints in the worksheets and the discussions. There is an emphasis on the importance of responding to guidelines "set by the marketplace, regardless of the independent group's unique needs." On the other hand, there is the viewpoint that "there should be a way of defining objectives and standards so that scholarly and research work can be done free from client considerations." He suggested that "one objective of this discussion . . . be to find ways of not being co-opted by client considerations." Cantelon agreed that this is an important point, especially for historians, "because historians who work on the inside, so to speak, have always been blamed for being court historians . . . somehow they are tainted by [being] closer to the situation

than a historian who is out and away, especially those dealing with recent history."

As far as co-optation in specific situations, he noted that, generally, government agencies and private corporations are not interested in the historian creating a point of view: "They are interested in what historical information actually is." History can be sold for what it is—a body of information—without destroying professional integrity. Brown concurred, noting that at the Newberry Library Indian History Center the staff and fellows are constantly asked for historical research by lawyers engaged in land claim cases and other matters. In one instance lawyers from two different sides of the same case were receiving historical assistance from Newberry personnel: "... they were simply doing historical research that the lawyers were then using in one way or another."

3. Funding

In summing up comments on the relationship of the independent sector to the university, and noting that it was also necessary to consider the relation of the independent sector to the larger society, Cantelon noted that historians, and other humanists, must explain to the larger society why it is important to do history. "If we can all explain why history is valuable to the academy and valuable to us personally, why the hell can't we explain it to the Chase Manhattan Bank ...?" Cimino, agreeing completely, urged that the services that the humanities and social sciences can provide have to be sold in the marketplace: "There has to be a real effort made to go out to the corporations and say, look, we know things that would be helpful to you."

Stanwick thought that to assume "a meaningful role in the larger society," meant "meeting the need of some group of individuals out there that exists, not just creating a role for ourselves." As an example she offered her center, which serves a specific constituency—women—and which does scholarly research which it then applies to social situations and public policy. "To me," she observed, "based on my

activist nature, it is, as independent institutions, what we can do." But in the last analysis, one does what one can get money to do. She thought that the "funding world, in a sense, wants that scholarly research but wants to see if it can have a public policy impact."

Shatan was disturbed by the orientation of these remarks, which he described as one of "meeting expectations and demands of clients . . ." Many universities already do that, he observed, by means of their schools of commerce, business, medicine, psychiatry, religion, nursing, and the like. Is this what the independent sector wants to emulate? His own view is that "we are gadflies and smashers of stereotypes, and I am not so sure the Chase Manhattan Bank is interested in that kind of product."

Groneman thought that there is a real possibility of fostering a public interest in the humanities; such interest has increased greatly of late, as expressed in all the Bicentennial programs, the TV program "Roots," and the like. This public desire for knowledge should be encouraged.

Helly raised the question of whether private and public humanities agencies have any particular responsibility toward the independent sector. Is it the responsibility of the independent sector to find its own funding outside traditional private and public funding agencies; is it a fixed-pie situation that will mean competition between the independent sector and the university? There is also the consideration that funding agencies, set up on an academic schedule, have no space within them for the concept of part-time scholarship. They must be "drawn along to the notion of long-term projects that are done by teams, perhaps even joint efforts of groups in the independent sector, and the crucial need here is for . . . a dialogue with funding agencies." Groneman said there are differences between the independent sector and academe with respect to financial needs. Independent-sector organizations, when they approach a funding agency, often lack the institutional support to provide the "in kind" services for the organization. Thus they often need more money, for a given project, than an organization that has a university base providing office space, copying facilities, and the like. On the other hand, universities also have huge overhead costs, which not all agencies fund. Addressing the question of the degree to

which funding agencies are "responsible" for independent-sector groups, she declared: "I think it's a question of what kinds of pressures are put on private and public humanities agencies to force them to assume that responsibility." Unless pushed, most agencies will not reach out to independent sector groups. NEH and other federal agencies need to be lobbied, as well as departments that sometimes fund scholarly research, such as Labor, HEW, etc. She said that she had heard that many of the state humanities councils are not putting their funds into programs that will bring the humanities to the public. If enough scholars and other people from independent-sector groups write letters to the state councils and talk with the council staffs, the councils will probably respond. Thus the councils, as well as all other funding agencies, must be educated. The need to continue the pressure is important, "because can it be argued that there is a moral obligation to fund the independent sector?

Helly replied that "obviously there is no moral obligation." Groneman thought there may be an obligation but that it is not an effective argument in fund raising. Gross replied that "the ultimate justification for what a foundation does is indeed moral," and that when that justification does not operate, the foundation "is contradicting what it says in its most potent statements and authoritative and legitimate statements [that] it is supposed to be doing." Agreeing that the argument from moral persuasion is "rarely efficacious," he concluded that it "has to be a criticism on the state of foundations."

4. Internal Organization

Helly stressed the importance of networks, calling them "the lifeline, the body, the soul, the spirit, the survival kit of the independent sector in the 1980s." Without these networks the independent sector may be a temporary phenomenon on the surface of American history. She defined networks as "ways we have yet to devise of communicating with one another on the individual and group level." Unless we help others to sustain their

ability "to do their own thing outside the academy as a group, we are too tiny to make any difference in the intellectual life of the next decade." Networking is thus the crucial way in which disparate groups, who are strong when connected but small and weak when isolated, can work together and "support the right of each other to be heard." Gross questioned the term network, because it can be applied in so many ways and contexts, and urged that independent-sector groups be flexible in their search for models of organization, looking not only to the academy but outside it, to public interest groups for example. He thought that in the independent sector "probably you have to be better to survive, whatever institutional supports you get."

II

WORKSHOP SESSIONS

3. Session Chaired by Hilah Thomas

1. Relationship with Academe

Hilah Thomas, the Chair, opened the discussion by asking what elements or attributes make an independent-sector group viable. She noted that independent-sector groups currently draw on essentially the same sources of funding as universities but suggested that they and the universities should not compete but should cooperate. Birnbaum thought there may be some value in an adversary relationship between the two groups. Lightman noted that the independent sector must offer some alternative to the current "ideology" of the university and its world. It must have the same credibility as the university, but in "a different frame." The problem is how the independent-sector groups will establish credibility, so that they are drawn upon by the greater society in the same way as universities are; otherwise they must always go to the university for their credibility.

Hynes said that fighting the university "is a false issue." The real issue is the purpose of independent-sector groups: what needs to be done, how, and what kind of constituency is represented and served. Gallagher, in

agreeing, observed that it will be easier for independent-sector groups to create their own credibility than to challenge that of the academy, "which I think is really status." Thomas, basing her remarks on the creation of The Institute for Research in History, emphasized the importance of filling needs; independent-sector groups must serve definite purposes in order to flourish. McIntosh spoke of the notches into which the woodpecker fits its bill in the search for food; these notches are the felt needs of successful organizations. In successful independent-sector groups, she noted, the members "feel human instead of defeated" and think "change is possible and pleasurable."

In response to observations about the problems of historians who feel redundant either to the academy or to society in general, Gordon spoke of his experiences with senior citizens, particularly white males "who had a lot of success and all of a sudden they feel they are not useful any longer. What we are trying to do is to keep them from preoccupation with their problems and help them realize there are links to form with all groups who yearn to do something creative . . ." There are only so many jobs, "so to pit the old against the young is not the answer either." This echoed the earlier statements that the independent sector should not compete with the academy for funds.

Remarks of a similar nature were made by Achtert, who discussed the founding of the Modern Language Association. People teaching modern languages formed the MLA "in an effort to support each other, since they tended to be isolated on various parts of the compass, but also to establish their own position within the university." As conditions changed, so has the MLA. Flexibility in the face of change, the group agreed, is extremely important for independent-sector groups, which achieve their first incarnation as the result of felt needs and cannot exist without filling these needs and others that may arise.

This raised the question of implementation. As Thomas put it: Whom do we serve and what are our products? Gallagher emphasized the value of the independent sector for the "disenfranchised" scholars outside the university and even those in the academy who are not comfortable there. Bledstein observed that the disenfranchised often seek to enter the academy, even in the face of great

obstacles, in order to maintain their professional identity. One function of independent-sector groups is to help create this identity by providing a community where intellectual work may be discussed, criticized, and supported. Thomas thought that "disenchanted" was a more apt description of scholars in the academy who do not feel themselves to be part of that university community.

Another reason for a scholar to approach an independent-sector group is more practical: less red tape and lower overhead in administering grants. As a result, scholars who have university positions sometimes work through independent-sector groups anyway. This has happened with The Institute for Research in History. Sinanoglou added that often the full grant-getting services of universities are limited to tenured faculty. Bledstein noted that he had an NEH grant, and "going through the university is hell. They created all kinds of problems, so many things had to be signed; an institute like this [IRH] would have done it much more quickly."

Hynes emphasized the nurturing aspect of the independent sector. To a large extent, he thought, the academy is not providing the feedback necessary for scholarly work because it is preoccupied with other things. Bledstein noted that "the academy judges people and standards, which it is not set up to do. Except at the teaching level it is done mostly outside their offices. I'm there essentially to teach and then I run away and go down to the library; if the meaning is not in the work, if that isn't there, there is no reason to remain in the academy. There is no money but a lot of abuse."

Thomas then raised the question of whom the independent sector will allow into its membership. So far, it has used academic criteria. Bledstein noted that, at least in history, "if you exclude the PhD you nullify your legitimacy." Gillett asked about the Institute for Research in History and its constitutionally mandated size limitation of 300 members. In California, where an institute similar to the IRH is being established, this limitation is viewed as something negative, elitist. The limit, Lightman responded, is intended to help recreate the kind of free intellectual discourse that is often encountered among graduate students. However, she continued, if the limit proves to be a

burden, it will be altered by a constitutional amendment. To date, this had not been a problem, because the number of members have stabilized at about 200. The Institute expects "a very serious commitment" from members: "We are saying you not only send money but you must participate in a research group, reading, thinking and working history." Finally, she noted that the limitation in membership is based on historical models. When the Institute applied for tax exempt status, it was explained to the Internal Revenue Service that 300 members constituted the upper limit of communal groups throughout history, including Israeli kibbitzim and early Christian monasteries in Egypt. "The ultimate credentials," observed Thomas.

Weisert exhorted the group to move on to the topic of functions and services "that go beyond this community into a market place . . . " McIntosh thought that the independent sector could unearth new material and expose new ideas, "revising reality by putting new models into the data we have." Institutes can do this more easily than universities, she argued, because people in research institutes are often mavericks. Bronte added that in her experience historians in the academy "tend to define their constituency as pretty much matriculating students."

Yet at the same time, noted Bledstein, universities "want to do what is popular among the people," and as a result "begin to look like a circus, like museums have been affected, and so forth."

2. Funding

Sinanoglou raised the issue of funding, noting that different sources of money impose their own limitations: "You are restricted as to the kind of projects you can fund." Thomas asked what the independent sector could do for corporations, besides offer a tax deduction. Hynes related the example of a Chicago bank that hired humanities-trained people on a part-time basis for various kinds of analysis. In this case, the humanists were people trained in the religious ministry, "who are not hurting in the market like our humanistic professionals [but] are going into social services and so

forth." Corporations, he said, are open to this movement into secular work: "They think people with this kind of training can bring people together to talk to each other." In the case of the bank, the people were hired because of their humanities credentials, not their religious ones, and were considered valuable for long-range planning "for understanding where societies are going." Hynes also noted that many states have funded historians-in-residence-programs, where local communities receive the services of a trained historian, free of charge, to help on specific projects.

3. Internal Organization

Thomas asked what factors enable independent-sector groups to "take off" and be effective and innovative. Bronte suggested that "one of the most critical factors is leadership." The leadership must be "committed, energetic and creative," and consistently and closely involved with the programs of the organization. By leadership she meant not necessarily a single person, but a group of people who work together harmoniously: "there is only a certain amount of friction that an organization can stand without beginning to splinter."

Hynes raised the importance of role models. In any given organization, a person or several persons will serve as models who help establish goals and provide sources of energy. He cited The Institute for Research in History as an organization where ideas are encouraged to flow, which stimulates everyone "to work for their best potential." Bronte thought that "women's approaches" to organization differ from men's, in that women take more explicit notice of the influences of personal relationships and feelings in creating and developing organizations. The organizational formalities characteristic of highly traditional institutions, both university and non-university "are largely a function of this male cultural structure." While women have much to learn about the "more formal ways men have created to get things done, some of which are brilliant," men have a great deal to gain from assimilating women into these organizations and becoming more sensitive to the needs of people.

It seemed to Hynes that there was a need for "both the logic and the nurturing." Independent-sector organizations, he argued, should avoid stereotypes and concentrate on spirit: "The spirit must be there and you build from that." Bronte agreed, but noted that members of the independent sector work with many people who operate along traditional lines, such as those of the university. Hynes observed that one has to decide one way or the other, about working with traditional structures. "You have to make a judgment to try to fit that mold," and sometimes, he suggested, it might not be appropriate to try to change that structure. Bledstein replied that this view has real dangers, because "it just continues stereotypes." The problems, he argued, are primarily organizational, and secondarily male. The women who are at the top of the traditional structures are "not feeling and caring and so forth . . . They act in the same manner that all people act at the top of organizations." In other words, he continued, it is possible to find many men "who care and are concerned with spirit, too," but not at the organizational apex.

Hynes thought that both approaches to organization are necessary. The process of creativity, he noted, contains two elements: the first is "sustaining the feeling of making people feel plugged in and really vital and having something to contribute—a highly nurturing, caring stage;" the second "is criticism and feedback on what is being done." Bledstein thought the two elements mutually contradictory, because in providing criticism one inevitably creates tension, and by setting standards—for admission, for example—one excludes some people. Thomas replied that criticism might indeed produce tension in one way, but would not necessarily negate the value which a person placed on belonging to a particular group. She cited the example of an article submitted for publication. Even if it is refused, the author may gain from the criticism of the editors: "I may offer that work for criticism for any number of reasons; I'm still in the position where I can use it."

Gordon noted that creative work is done at a different pace at various times in one's life. This issue, he continued, has been raised by people in their sixties who don't want to be retired from an active life; they are beginning to organize, and in doing so are creating new constituencies. This

will happen not only with older people, but with others as well, as the "disenfranchised" seek a greater role in society. Universities, he suggested, "are not reaching great numbers of people in need of moral support, but at least moral is not financial. If people are on our side, we don't have to worry about funding." Thomas agreed, noting that the Institute for Research in History is "only moderately successful financially," yet performs a valuable "life-boat function."

III

GENERAL SESSION

Chair: Dorothy Helly

Dorothy Helly: I'm going to throw open discussion to the floor with just a couple of comments. What we have on the table, in terms of the workshop reports [which began the General Session], are rather significant statements. We will be independent. Having moved away from one kind of superstructure, scholars in the independent sector are clearly not ready to adopt any other kind until a number of questions are addressed. How can such groups continue to discuss with each other ideas, problems, and possibilities? Further, it is necessary, in terms of potential growth, for independent-sector groups to find some way of continuing to discuss with each other what has or has not proved to be successful in their operations as independent groups. If there is one thing that independent groups do that has often failed in traditional structures, it is developing the sense of community that comes from face-to-face contact. Finally, if one does think about a future for such groups, that future will indeed depend upon the commitment of people involved, the commitment to experiment, to continue to ask questions about what they are doing and how they are going to do it. I'd now like to throw open the discussion from the floor.

Hilah Thomas: I'm wondering if, without creating a lot of top-heavy stuff, there is some way of instituting something of the kind that developed in other areas. For example, in baby-sitting swapping, where I give you three hours and I've got three hours credit. I can draw on this "people bank" when I need to get away. Is there any way that groups represented here, and maybe some others we can think of, can develop a resource bank like that? We would create credit on each other's expertise, in some way, without a lot of money passing hands. Would that be a kind of network we haven't tried yet?

Jean Quandt: I wish I had more details on this, but I have a friend on our planning committee, who is the New Jersey coordinator for something the American Council on Education is running on women in higher education. The intent is to promote women in administrative careers. What they do, without any counting of how many hours are owed, is to establish a network where people call on each other for advice and information. It seems to work well on an informal basis.

Philip Cantelon: I think the network idea is fine; however, you will discover that you are talking among yourselves again. If anything has been demonstrated by this conference, it is that the concerns are what a particular research institute in history is, and I think that loses force by being placed under the umbrella of a national organization. I think we have to talk to one another. This is all a great experiment, and now is the time we need the reinforcement of groups.

Marlene Wortman: I would like to add that we are not thinking of historians alone; at least half of the people here are not historians. I would like to see a network that goes across all boundaries. I would like to see many networks, each of them involving groups that are alike and having a center that would send out the names of all of them to still other networks. You can cross lines, bring together people from different backgrounds.

Philip Cantelon: What I've seen happening is that all of these organizations for people not directly related to the

academic world have bubbled up to the surface, and the Institute for Research in History has, at this conference, addressed the concerns that I have seen in the groups formed in Washington. It is important not to get absorbed into any national group but to contribute substantially to each individual group and give it more clout than it might have otherwise.

Marjorie Lightman: I don't know if I quite understand. It seems to me, at least from the consensus of the workshop groups I was a part of, that you are fighting for the equivalent of the locust's right for a day in the sun. While I see that larger national groups would offer services, I'm rather frightened of being swallowed up by one. Other than the problems already stated, there are some different perspectives that came out in the workshops. I think we should start to talk about what sentiment there is for a homogeneous, overriding organization.

Alison Bernstein: It sounds to me as if the idea of The Institute for Research in History or the independent sector is to become an independent entity itself. Instead of responding to a set of problems, we can become too easily shunted aside and become the non-academic version of people who want to get away from society. It's important to be "cost effective." I want to see more discussion about communality and differences; and it might well be that the Institute, as a model, can show where the need to have a community is so essential. However, in other kinds of places it might be the AAUW that creates the umbrella among interdisciplinary people.

Marjorie Lightman: I think that your point on lack of information is very well taken. There is no single model: the question of diversity is very real. How much diversity and development is there in the country at large, where is the independent sector taking its models from, where is its leadership coming from? How does it find other groups to lean on, to learn from, to act as mentor, so it doesn't re-invent the wheel? I think those are the two matters that we have to address. In this room is a good geographical distribution. A list of that geographically distributed group, with phone numbers, could give a focal point, an informal

focal point for getting information for groups seeking information within various parts of the country. We should work toward a clear definition of what is "networking." For instance, in concrete terms, we could have groups in various parts of the country agree that they will take responsibility for incoming calls and letters, and leave it at that. Should Richard Brown get a call about a particular subject, he knows that the person calling might be better off in another group; he has a referral list, he doesn't need more than that. This is a model built on the co-op nursery school. It has worked for them, it could work for us.

Philip Cantelon: Where would we be if we were a diverse group? The answer is sitting in this room, and as was said before, isn't that what we are all interested in?

Karen Rubinson: I want to go back to the question that initiated all of this. The idea of another functioning network, at this point, I really don't think has to be formal, and at best could be that list of names, addresses and telephone numbers. I speak partly from experience. The network from which I got a job, outside of my profession, was a list of names, addresses, and telephone numbers of the alumni of the college I went to. I have since become a very important cog in that wheel, and that is how it has to work. You have to take the initiative, the responsibility to participate. It is a question of being available to everybody, regardless of their major interest or major focus.

James Banner: Number one, something I don't think has been said publicly yet, that is, how extraordinary an occasion this has been, how important I suspect in history. I would like to say how extraordinary and exciting it has been, and our thanks. Second, I would caution us all against working to death the structures we will assume. I think Marjorie, as usual, is dead right in her wisdom, that efforts such as this take time to develop in momentum. It takes time to understand the activities we are venturing into; time, understanding, planning and foresight. In the third place, I think we don't want to contribute to fragmentation of which you are all a part. Our job is to help all in the humanities and social sciences and not subtract from them. Our job is to work with the academics and scholarly

associations, and at this time we try to contribute to the work we all share and are committed to. Now, the fourth matter is the role of the AAAH. We will try to extend our help in a number of ways, to the efforts taking place here, at the very least in getting information out about this effort and future efforts relating to it. The AAAH serves a definite purpose for the future of learning and our capacity to carry on our pursuit of knowledge in the country. I think we should work together, and we will.

Deborah Gardner: I think that cooperation is the key for the future and underlies the idea of networks. Your point about fragmentation, I think, is well taken. In our workshop groups we dealt with this, and we did discuss the fact that the independent institutes are trying to overcome the fragmentation by movement among the various sectors. The individuals or historians move from the university to the business world to the local community, through an entire life cycle of traditional careers in one institution, to get away from fragmentation, and to show these other sectors that trained humanists add to the dimensions of their activities. I think that we would like to see all of the organizations in an equal capacity rather than seeing one organization over the other.

The AAAH has a different origin than the independents, and they know that is a clear difference. The AAAH comes from a different position, of trying to advance a particular sector of activities in this country. I think that cooperatively we can certainly advance the cause of all humanists. This I believe can be achieved by not having one organization leading another, but rather working together.

Marjorie Lightman: There is certainly not too much that can be said for cooperation. I had experience outside the profession and in organizations of local groups, and one of the things that became apparent very soon, as we began to try to coordinate, was that there was a tremendous overhead. While it was a very good example of fragmentation, one cannot ignore we chance losing individual inspiration by being drawn into an overly strong coordinated movement. There needs to be room for individualism in organizations and development.

Richard Kirkendall: Since we are talking about cooperation, I feel compelled to get up and say a few words. I've been to a series of related meetings in the past six months, starting at Santa Barbara with the first national meeting of public historians, and then on to Washington in June to a meeting called "New Careers." A meeting in Washington in early September put together by Jack Hall, an organization of federal historians, and now this meeting itself have been enormously illuminating to me. It has demonstrated to me just how much vitality and creativity there is in the historical profession.

Some people in the historical profession and other parts of the humanities are throwing up their hands and saying we are all doomed. Other people are coming up with new ideas and new programs, and this is enormously exciting and encouraging, I think. Why do I go to all of these meetings? I go because I think it is my responsibility to find out what is going on in the historical profession and try to make the OAH a much more useful organization than it is. I think it performs a number of useful services and has for quite a few years. But it is equally clear that it could become much more useful that it is.

The OAH can't serve every member in this group: it is concerned only with American history. However, it can serve people who are interested in the study of American history and can serve many more than it is at present, or at least in many more ways than it does at present. I hope people involved in groups like this Institute will think of the OAH as one of those organizations that they should try to influence, and that they will pressure us to do things that we should be doing. I also hope you will think of me as a person you can turn to, who has a great interest in what you are doing and a great interest in trying to change the organization that I work for.

Alison Bernstein: There are some concrete issues which are not institutional issues. There are ways to deal with these cross-cutting problems that don't require national organizations, but good will on the part of people from the institutes and the people who represent those keys to the kingdom, to the professional kingdom. There might be things to correct. Sooner or later some of the vested interest will begin to

emerge and that is the cutting edge of good, solid controversy. It would be good to talk about these cross-cutting issues and all kinds of other things that will emerge.

Joan Holtzman: I haven't heard the word "power" used. It is the issue that I want to turn to. There are needs for all kinds of organizations to do all kinds of things: I don't know what the advancement of humanities as a program means in terms of all the various people who assist not only themselves, but others in the humanities. One could seek to advance the humanities or humanists. I think cooperation is important. I think you should support anybody who says "I'm interested" but I think very often what happens is that the spirit of cooperation gets lost in the question of power and everybody's needs. It's not peculiar to any profession and I would like to hear more about that.

Marjorie Lightman: I think we *are* talking about power. We are all talking about power, and on different levels. Personal power, individual, institutional power, collective power. I think we are using the language we were taught, to provide issues where we can agree so we need not talk about those things on which we disagree.

I think of my Institute. With questions of power there have been marvelous discussions which range from the empire of Rome to British imperialism. We have consistently come down on the side of confederation, that is, not to become a national organization. It's a conscious decision which rests on the philosophical approach to corporate powers within the non-private sector, and it is the result of being a student of the 1960s. Women of the feminist movement think they can defend corporate power best by preserving individual power and rights within the home and the institute. I think I speak for my Board, who feel very strongly about giving up any individuality, any identity, to another group. It would, however, welcome any other group into a confederation.

William Hynes: I'm torn about whether we should stop there or not. Number one, I'm struck at this point, at this point in good conferences, which are the only kind to attend, at the ritual of closure that we wrestle with. How do

we close this, or do we continue on and keep the contacts going? Normally a new organization keeps up contacts. Second, I've been able to go in to several other organizations outside the field of religion and see how they operate, and I find that very useful for me personally. I would like to mention that the National Academy of Religion is having its meeting next month in New York City and I will provide the Institute with a copy of their program. There are particular subjects in there of interest.

Ronald Gross: I would just like to speak in support of what Alison Bernstein is suggesting. It seems to me it is easy, and I think necessary, to think of specific, practical projects. What I can't imagine, is that anyone involved in this would not benefit from it and not support it. It opens the ability of publication, access, case study and viability. Ordinarily these are things everybody needs and must be done, and I think it necessary to grapple somehow with by whom and how they can be accomplished.

Deborah Gardner: Along the lines of trying to convince certain sectors of the academic world that they should have more flexibility to allow people to move in and out of universities—to do this will have an effect on the quality of the humanities in the university. How can we get more of these projects going?

Alison Bernstein: Jim Banner hosted a meeting in Washington. They talked about a fellowship they had that brought a micro-biologist into the government for a year. He mentioned that the people who got this fellowship tended to be women. They were taking a lower salary, but this was one way to unfreeze the academic, public interest, and public service communities. We have, in Washington, all kinds of programs funded by Ford Foundation and others, and historians do not avail themselves in the way that they could. New places like the AAAH, located in Washington, or the IRH might well serve a function because they have that link to the outside world that a lot of academic programs don't have.

Nina Cobb: I'd like to speak to the question of fragmentation. If you have more people teaching in universities and

going in and out—we get back to what are the standards by which you can judge people doing work outside the university. It is critical, and I think that is where we are going to have to focus our attention.

Hilah Thomas: I have a lot of concerns which are similar. If your agenda is to change the college and university, the person coming in has minimal chances of doing it. They cannot go in and be effective in one year. They will be greeted on the most formal level and that will be the end of it.

Alison Bernstein: The Institute for Research in History plays a very important role because they have feet in both worlds, in a way. That might not be quite as threatening to the academic community.

Peggy McIntosh: I found more knowledge in the discussion within our workshop than in this section. I have been wondering why it is that we work best in small groups. When we function outside, we are trying to make ourselves operate independently, and this can be a very useful image. I want to give an example of how that can work if you want to have a foot outside the academy.

In many so-called faculty development programs, including the one I'm administering, they have been giving leaves of absence to revise curriculum. The academy knows that a faculty member wants release time. The university also benefits because release time is paid for by an outside source. The individual benefits by being allowed to leave the university to do independent thinking of a kind that is potentially revolutionary. The universities are happy to allow their faculty to have release time for which the university is not responsible, which may enrich the curriculum, but the research has not been completed efficiently by the university. I like the thought that radical thinking can go on in an institute and yet be useful to the university without putting the university through a big reflective process.

Nina Cobb: It's very important to humanists who can be influential outside the university, outside the business world. Undergraduates who see this can therefore feel free

to take courses in the humanities, which is a way to create a far more healthy situation.

Dorothy Helly (Chair): One of the reasons I belong to more research groups than I can handle is they give me intellectual highs. We have now been through about all the points we can go through, and they give us food for thought for a long time to come. I call on Marjorie to help us wrap things up.

Marjorie Lightman: An advantage of being one of the conference coordinators is that I have the privilege of the last word. Thank you for coming. I have enjoyed myself thoroughly for two days. I hope you have enjoyed yourselves. I welcome you anytime you are in New York to come and visit us at the Institute. If you come when we are stuffing envelopes, you will be put to work. We will be sending you a revised list of all conference participants with mailing addresses. Since we did not resolve the question of an organization versus a network, we will continue to do what we can. I would like to thank Mariam Chamberlain for all her backing and help.

I did lose an academic job a few years ago and I came to find an outside world I did not know existed. In truth, as Virgil said of the reign of Augustus, I look forward to a golden age. Thank you.

CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS

Walter Achtert Modern Language Association, New York City

James Banner, Jr. American Association for the Advancement of the Humanities, Washington, D.C.

Thomas Bender The New York Institute for the Humanities, New York City

Alison Bernstein Fund for the Improvement of Post Secondary Education, Washington, D.C.; The Institute for Research in History

Lucia Chiavola Birnbaum American Italian Historical Association, Berkeley, California

Burton Bledstein University of Illinois, Chicago Circle Campus

Lydia Bronte Rockefeller Foundation, New York City

Richard Brown The Newberry Library, Chicago, Illinois

Harold Cannon National Endowment for the Humanities, Washington, D.C.

Philip L. Cantelon C. & W. Associates and National Council on Public History, Washington, D.C.

Andrew G. Caranfil Hudson Institute, Croton-on-Hudson, New York

Mariam Chamberlain Ford Foundation, New York City

Louis Cimino American Anthropological Association, Washington, D.C.

Nina Cobb Rockefeller Foundation, New York City and The Institute for Research in History

Deborah Gardner University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania and The Institute for Research in History

Paula Gillett The Institute of Historical Study, San Francisco, California

Philip Gordon Academy of Independent Scholars, Boulder, Colorado

Carol Groneman New York Council for the Humanities, New York City

Ronald Gross Future Directions for a Learning Society, New York City

Dorothy Helly Hunter College, CUNY, New York City and The Institute for Research in History

Joan Holtzman Programs in Public Philosophy, Larchmont, New York

Edith Hurwitz Center for Independent Study, New Haven, Connecticut and The Institute for Reserch in History

William J. Hynes American Academy of Religion, Washington, D.C.

Marion Kaplan Council for European Studies, New York City

Richard S. Kirkendall Organization of American Historians, Washington, D.C.

Dorothy Lipson Center for Independent Study, New Haven, Connecticut and The Institute for Research in History

Warren Bryan Martin Danforth Foundation, St. Louis, Missouri

Peggy McIntosh Wellesley College, Center for Research on Women in Higher Education and the Professions, Wellesley, Massachusetts

Johanna Mendelson Latin American Studies Association, and Center for Defense Research, Washington, D.C.

Lyla O'Driscoll Society for Women in Philosophy, New York City

Vassiliki Paraskevopoulou Hudson Institute, Croton-on-Hudson, New York

Jean Quandt Princeton Center, Princeton, New Jersey and The Institute for Research in History

Susannah Rubenstein The Center for Independent Study, New Haven, Connecticut and The Institute for Research in History

Karen Rubinson Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner and Smith, New York City; The Institute for Research in History

Malcolm G. Scully Chronicle of Higher Education, Washington, D.C.

Chaim Shatan New York University, New York City

Loannis Sinanoglou The Council for European Studies, New York City

Kathy Stanwick Center for the American Woman and Politics, New Brunswick, New Jersey

Paul Stellhorn New Jersey Committee for the Humanities, New Brunswick, New Jersey

Hilah F. Thomas Women's History Project of The United Methodist Church, General Commission on Archives and History, New York City and Lake Junaluska, North Carolina; The Institute for Research in History

Robert Varady Organization of Asi· · Research Scholars, Tucson, Arizona

Hilde Weisert National Diffusion Network, Washington, D.C.

Carolyn Wilson Woodrow Wilson Fellowship Foundation, Princeton, New Jersey

Ronald Woods Afro-American Studies Society, Eastern Michigan University, Ypsilanti, Michigan

Marlene Wortman The Institute for Research in History

Yadja Zeltman YIVO Institute for Jewish Research, New York City

CONFERENCE COORDINATORS:

Marjorie Lightman The Institute for Research in History

Howard Negrin The Institute for Research in History

ORDER FORM

To:

The Haworth Press
149 Fifth Avenue
New York, N.Y. 10010

Please send me:

____ copy(ies) **OUTSIDE ACADEME** at the single-copy price of $12.00, plus $1.00 postage and handling charge

I enclose my check for $_____. *Remember to include postage and handling charge.*

Note: All single-copy orders must be accompanied by payment.

____ copies of **OUTSIDE ACADEME** at the bulk-copy price of $100.00 per 10 copies, plus $2.00 postage and handling charge

____ Please bill me.

____ Please add my name to your mailing list.

Name _____

Address _____

_____

The Institute for Research in History is a non-profit organization of scholars in history and the humanities, founded in 1975 to provide a source of collegial contact and to generate research projects for scholars working outside the academic community. The Institute publishes two journals, *Trends in History*, and *Women & History*, and has a growing number of research, exhibition, and scholarly and publishing projects.

The Institute for Research in History
432 Park Avenue South
New York, N.Y. 10016
(212) 689-1931

ISBN 0-86656-132-3

81